1981

Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter and the realism of the supernatural

Regina Berrit Braker
Portland State University

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Regina Berrit Braker for the Master of Arts in German presented July 31, 1981.

Title: Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter and the Realism of the Supernatural.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[redacted]
Roderic C. Diman, Acting Chairman

[redacted]
William B. Fischer

[redacted]
Franz Langhammer

[redacted]
Franklin C. West

In interpreting Der Schimmelreiter by Theodor Storm, the deconstructive method always leaves room for more interpretation; a deconstructive interpretation may simply acknowledge a variety of critical opinions, not necessarily considering one more valid than another, but arguing that all of them together are necessary to form a collective interpretation. I have examined traditionally important views of Storm's work, those of Stuckert and Silz, who argue for a positive heroic example in the main character Hauke Haien, and who consider the

supernatural in a less structurally important light, but attribute it to Storm's personal views and geographic background. Ellis, Findlay and Jennings offer an examination of narrative structures and a study of mythic elements in the structure. They break some of the longer-held opinions, redefine realism and draw attention to conflicting character traits of Hauke, suggesting psychological explanations for his mythification. Jost Hermand represents the new directions in social commentary. His interpretation emphasizes possible political criticisms and examines the work in the light of German society in the late nineteenth century.

No one interpretation delimits the work completely, and all of them cannot accomplish a complete deconstruction. And yet, considered as a body of interpretation, such a variety of critical views is a step toward a broader understanding of Der Schimmelreiter.

I have examined the diachronic development of the narrative structure as the temporal element of the legend. I have argued that the conceptual basis as found in the supernaturalism, ritual and myth is the place where "originary" meaning occurs; the paradoxes which we find there are significant to an interpretation of Der Schimmelreiter, but also to an interpretation of broader social legend.

The problem of human achievement and its limitations is presented to us by Storm in a complex frame structure which deserves careful deconstructive consideration of the narrator's stance in transmitting the legend, but also of its significance for interpretation: its reception.

Throughout this study I have argued that the combination of vagueness and precision, of temporal distance and subjective immediacy,

of seeming realism and apparent supernaturalism is essential to the meaning of Der Schimmelreiter. At the center of any interpretation of this novella is Hauke Haien. His defiant position in the legend towards nature and society obviates the need for a social interpretation of the legend, both in regard to a fictive society and the reader's real society.

Despite the fact that Der Schimmelreiter reflects and addresses issues which characterized Storm's own time, it may be concluded that Der Schimmelreiter is for all times, warning the reader that if human conflicts continue unresolved they can destroy completely.

The problem of Der Schimmelreiter may be summed up in an assessment of Storm's success with this work. He has created a literary work of art: a richly textured text whose context must be considered. Precisely because of its multiplicity of narrative levels and its combination of realism and myth, the text expresses a range of meanings which should be viewed not as contradictory, but rather complementary facets of the evolution, and the transmission and reception of a time-bound, yet timeless and ultimately timely legend.

THEODOR STORM'S DER SCHIMMELREITER

AND

THE REALISM OF THE SUPERNATURAL

by

REGINA BERRIT BRAKER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
GERMAN

Portland State University

1981

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Regina Braker presented 31 July 1981.

[redacted]

William B. Fischer, Chairman

[redacted]

Franz Langhammer

[redacted]

Franklin C. West

APPROVED:

[redacted]

Roderic C. Diman, Acting Head, Department of Foreign Languages

[redacted]

Stanley E. Rauch, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to William B. Fischer for all of his advice and for his constant encouragement.

The edition of Der Schimmelreiter used throughout the body of this thesis is the Phillip Reclam Edition. All translations to English from that text were made by me.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the following study I intend to examine Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter from a "deconstructive" viewpoint. My particular focus of attention is the complex tension between the rational and irrational elements which will be analyzed according to the origin, transmission and reception of a narration which should be regarded in both the literary and anthropological senses as a legend, even though critics have categorized it as a classic example of Literary Realism. Der Schimmelreiter is both a realistic story about a specific historical culture and a timeless legend. Nevertheless - or precisely therefore - it reflects and addresses issues which characterized Storm's own time.

Storm's critics almost universally regard Der Schimmelreiter as his master novella, and the work can indeed serve as an example of that foremost genre of late 19th century German literature. The text offers challenges in both content and style. Two striking features of the text, its narrative framework and the strong presence of the supernatural, have constantly challenged critics. The interaction of these two elements will constitute the central focus of the present study. A satisfactory interpretation of Der Schimmelreiter requires a study of the text on various narrative and symbolic levels, and in particular a consideration of the supernatural elements at each level. Lastly, any general interpretation of the novella must consider the relation of the supernatural to Literary Realism, however the latter is defined.

Yet despite its place in the literary canon, Der Schimmelreiter cannot simply or accurately be categorized as a classic novella. Perhaps the expression itself is meaningless. Late nineteenth century German literature offers a kaleidoscope of styles and perspectives which are often taken to represent the various literary movements of the time. Although we can attempt to assign each text to a genre or movement and then seek to place each movement within temporal boundaries, the germination of one movement may coincide with the climax of a preceding one, and the remaining undercurrents of a still earlier movement may continue to exert their force. There are a variety of influences and circumstances which constantly redefine and modify each literary movement. A development in one literary style may affect the direction of another.

Thus, while elements of Biedermeier may be found to exist during the height of Realism, at the same time certain traits of Naturalism have begun to emerge as well. We cannot, of course, merely state that a work belongs to a given movement because it falls within the supposed corresponding time period. Nor are the author's own classifications or interpretations definitive. His literary view, as presented in letters, articles and other evidence of aesthetic, philosophic, or ideological inclinations, may identify him with a school of thought, but ultimately the literary work contains additional characteristics which also affect our assessment of the work itself and the period to which it belongs and which it in turn helps constitute.

Even so, the work must be studied for the elements which make it representative of one movement or another. While we must avoid facile classification, we cannot base our judgment about the nature of the

work solely on a consideration of the isolated text, for we may find that a purely textual analysis may deny aspects of the work's actual effect and effectiveness in a literary period. Such an analysis may also lead to difficulties which concern the author's intention and the work's reception - both highly problematic matters. Furthermore, there is a problem in defining the literary movements. Though each exhibits characteristic traits, each movement is also described by comparison with other literary currents. Such considerations, including Jauß' idea of text to genre relationships ("gattungsbildende Textreihe") should apply as well to the individual literary work.[1]

For these reasons, among others, the specific problem of supernatural elements in Storm's work has not been settled yet, and perhaps never will be. A variety of explanations has been offered. On the one hand is the older view which emphasized Storm's position as a writer of regional literature and correspondingly explained the supernatural as a realistic element which has its source in actual transmitted myth. Thus, the first author of the myth would be the Frisian people and their superstitions. E. Allen McCormick sees the supernatural elements as inherent in the oral tradition which Storm draws on as source material.[2] Franz Stuckert interprets the myth as defined by its supernatural elements, and as an expression of a supposed world-view.[3] Such an interpretation ignores Storm as the active author of the supernatural elements, in the dual sense of "authority" and "creator." McCormick and Stuckert argue for an idealistic positive view of man's ability to achieve greatness. The infusion of supernatural reflects the hard reality of the world, according to Stuckert.[4] Walter Silz and Johannes Klein[5] would agree that myth contains irrational traits.

Storm is responsible for the supernatural, for he chose the myth to express his own understanding of the world. Since the focus in Der Schimmelreiter is on human experience, Silz can reconcile the irrational as an aspect of form within the novella:

> The matter of the Novelle, with its bias toward particular cases of human experience, tends toward realism; at the same time its form as we have seen calls for a high degree of conscious art.[6]

Fritz Martini considers the supernatural to represent the irrationality of fate in the world order. For him the supernatural is expressed in symbolic or analagous terms. Therefore it no longer poses a problem in realism since symbols are not real; they represent reality. Furthermore, Martini interprets the paradoxical rational and irrational elements as a part of the inherent contradiction of life:

> Das Mehrdeutige der Themenführung, das mehrschichtige Sehen und Sprechen in der Gleichzeitigkeit von Außen und Innen, die Ironie des immanenten Widerspruchs, die Technik der verhüllten Motive, der vieldeutigen Spieglungen und reziproken Erhellungen - dies alles deutet auf das Komplexe der in der Novelle dargestellten Welterfahrung. Sie spiegelt gewiß nicht nur die "verbürgerlichte" Welt dieser Jahrzehnte, sondern sie zeigt weit mehr die Problematisierung dieser Welt im Ineinander von Sprengendem und Ordnung, von Innerlichkeit und Schicksal.[7]

Martini does not see how the mythic content is related to narrative form (a formalistic argument) and thus to social interpretation (a sociological point).

For Klein the need for a broader understanding which includes irrational elements is a wider encompassing realism.[8] Silz argues further for a personal realism which reflects the author's "Weltanschauung."[9] Klein and Silz consider the irrational in the novella less an important part of the text than as a projection of the author's ideas. Lee Jennings expands the interpretation of personal perspective

He redefines poetic realism to include Storm's world view and regards the supernatural as compatible in poetic realism:

> If the bizarre outgrowths of an author's fantasy can be shown to pertain to acute and elemental questions of existence, that is all the more reason to esteem the work of such an author in an age weary of "real" trivia, wary of romantic fairy tales, and anxious for an art successfully synthesizing the two extremes - an art that does not forsake aesthetic unity and concerns itself with some reality more significant than the prosaic and external - in short, a "poetic realism" in the best sense.[10]

Such realism need not be consistent with "bourgeois realism," according to Jennings.

Ian Findlay argues that Storm's opinions or beliefs are not necessarily the same as those expressed by Der Schimmelreiter. Findlay's analysis of the supernatural goes one step further, with a dual purpose: to explore the mythical qualities within the text, to look also at Storm's beliefs and then to reconcile the two. Findlay's main concern with the myth is its meaning in the context of the narration. The irrational, for him, is inherent in archetypal myth-making.[11] He explores the psychological implications of myth.

John Ellis bases his structural interpretation on a study of narration: "The whole frame with all its narrators needs to be examined; between us and the "real" events of the story of the "real" people there is a broad barrier involving many different perspectives."[12] Ellis, however considers the fundamental ideas of legends rather than their sources to be of greater importance. His study aims at interpreting the textual concepts in a consistent manner. Ellis' efforts lead him to conclusions much like those of Jost Hermand. Hermand stresses the importance of examining Der Schimmelreiter in its contemporary historical context. Storm's political attitudes must be taken

into account, he argues, and for Hermand it is possible to examine the work in the light of its socio-political background. More specifically, he sees the hero as an example of the late nineteenth century hero ("Gründerzeitlichem Genie"). Although Storm presents the hero as a genius, according to Hermand, he is estranged by the hero's unlimited pride and lack of balance. He allows that always more than one explanation is possible for each phenomenon, either an idealistic-heroic or a realistic-analytic interpretation. This potential for a variety of interpretation permits the work to be studied from a realistic perspective.[13]

Each of the interpretations I have discussed has its merits as well as its flaws. One of the most recent developments in literary criticism is the deconstructive method, also referred to as "post-structuralism," a reaction against the widely popular structuralism of the sixties. I have found this method most useful in my study of Der Schimmelreiter. Although opposed to structuralism, Josué Harrari writes, deconstruction

> relies on structuralist premises in order, paradoxically, to show that structuralism has not fully pursued the implications of those premises. The post-structuralist attitude is therefore literally unthinkable without structuralism.[14]

Post-structuralist criticism has gained a wider audience through scholarly exchanges and symposia and many consequent publications. Literary scholars are realizing that the contribution of post-strucuralist methods can no longer be ignored.

Unlike New Criticism, or its European equivalents such as "textimmanente Kritik" deconstructive theory suggests that the text encompasses more than the work by itself. Indeed, the structuralism

from which it developed emphasized the social (or anthropological) context of language and conversely, the "linguistic" structure of society. Deconstruction removes the apparent contradictions of the text, and focuses on the written text in a metaphorical manner. Important questions ask what is the text, who is the author, what are the origins. Such questions widen the critical discussion to include biographic-historical and sociological analysis as well as receptional theory and history, which studies the fictive or actual reader, and how his perception of the text may have changed with time.

By dealing with problems of narration and the definition of author and narrator, the deconstructive method indeed evaluates a literary work and its structures intrinsically. Yet deconstruction also strives for a study of literature which takes extrinsic elements into consideration; defining the text as read by the non-critical reader as well as by the critic. Rather than only examining biographical or historical information, deconstructive criticism considers any elements which contribute meaning to the text. By continuously delimiting the text, deconstruction aims at taking always one more step intthe direction of what Derrida calls "originary" meaning.[15]

In response to the textual critic's emphasis on studying the literary work solely as text, the post-structuralist asks: what is the text, and explores areas untouched by other contemporary critical methods. Studying the text involves the "tracing of a path among textual strata in order to stir up and expose forgotten and dormant sediments of meaning which have accumulated and settled into the text's fabric."[16] Besides studying the factors which lead to the construction of a literary work, the deconstructionist looks at the structure as

"inclusive" and "exclusive." The author is the arbitrator of structural parameters. The author can be described as serving a

> certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction.[17]

Der Schimmelreiter is often interpreted from a "Stormian" perspective; that is, it is argued that Storm's personal life and his geographic background are strongly reflected in this, as in many other of his works. As significant as the author-text relationship is in this work, it needs to be discussed generally in the light of recent critical theory.

According to Michel Foucault, the work is closely associated with the author. His work often includes a greater body of written material; but whether considered as a body of literature or a single piece, the work carries the stamp of the author, his "signature." This signature can be read in every one of his works, perhaps as a reflection of his life in the work, as a recurrent stylistic trait, or as literary influences which the author includes in the work. Thus, as Foucault remarks, we associate ideas or specific stylistic traits with the work of an author:

> An author's name is not simply an element in a discourse (capable of being either subject or object, of being replaced by a pronoun, and the like); it performs a certain role with regard to narrative discourse, assuring a classificatory function. Such a name permits one to group together a certain number of texts, define them, differentiate them from and contrast them to others.[18]

Still, more concretely, the work is defined physically, something we may hold or with which we may fill a library shelf, and refer to as the author's work.[19]

The text is derived from the symbolic nature of the work: "A work whose integrally symbolic nature one conceives, perceives, and receives is a text."[20] The text is defined by activity on a number of levels. The conception, perception and reception of the text are activities of both author and reader. Furthermore, textual activity does not stop at the reader. Reading the text is not an act of consumption, not a casual act. It is a productive activity in which the reader attempts to overcome the "unreadability" of the text, to bridge the gap between writing and reading:

> We must locate the space left empty by the author's disappearance, follow the distribution of gaps and breaches, and watch for the openings that this disappearance uncovers.[21]

Reading is, as it were, playing the text, in a musical sense. "Only the critic executes the work (in both senses)."[22] We may refer, for example, to Bach's Toccata in F and Virgil Fox's Bach Toccata in F. Critics may argue whether the former and the latter are the same "text," and in which sense the text has been executed by Fox. Such playing of the text is reproduction, without being mimesis. It is not imitation, but rather a completion of the creative process. The interpretive reading becomes a co-authorship, an enlargement of the text.

The author's role requires still further definition. Though the author may be seen as the "father" of the work, his textual relationship is different. The text may still contain the author's "signature," for example an "inscription" of the author in a character, but the author no longer assumes the same authority of ownership as can be perceived in an author-to-work relationship.

> If the author is a novelist, he inscribes himself in his text as one of his characters, as another figure sewn into the rug; his signature is no longer privileged and paternal, the locus

> of genuine truth, but rather, ludic . . . His life is no longer the origin of his fables, but a fable that runs concurrently with his work. There is a reversal, and it is the work which affects the life, not the life which affects the work . . . The I that writes the text is never, itself, anything more than a paper I. [23]

Because the author is - to a varying extent - a part of the text, we cannot ignore his function. Even if the author is unknown, his anonymity is an enigma, but his function in the text remains an important element to be considered among other textual factors.

The author in the text serves as a standard of value, a reference of theoretical understanding, a source of stylistic unity and historic reference.[24] The author is the basis for a clear explanation of events in a work. His decision to include them lends possible significance to their presence in the work. His function is to limit, exclude, and choose, and thereby to fill the work with "significations."[25] The basis for asking the question of meaning is the author. We cannot ignore the author-function: the intent in choosing to include and exclude.

The author-function is apparent even at the level of the author's name. Thus something more is signified by "Theodor Storm's Immensee" than that Storm wrote a work by that name. "Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter" may also signify something else. Each phrase defines and refers to different discourse. Even though the author is the same, the author-function has accomplished something very different in Immensee than it has in Der Schimmelreiter. The author's name becomes a common element, of which the reader is always aware. It may have varying meaning within the author's work and his name distinguishes his work form that of another author:

> The name seems always to be present, marking off the edges of the text, revealing or at least characterizing its mode of being. the author's name manifests the appearance of a certain discursive set and indicates the status of this discourse within a society and a culture.[26]

At the heart of the deconstructive discussion of the text and the function of the author within the text is the question of "center" or "origin." Derrida defines "center" somewhat cryptically as "a function, not a being - a reality, but a function. And this function is absolutely indispensable. The subject is absolutely indispensable. I don't destroy the subject; I situate it."[27] The whole purpose of discourse about a text is to pursue the center, the original or transcendental signified which is "never absolutely present outside a system of differences."[28] The center is absent; its absence makes discourse possible: "The absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and the interplay of signification ad infinitum."[29] The discourse becomes what Derrida calls "supplementarity." Something is always added, or is substituted in the absence of the center, but it allows always for something more to be said. The critic examines the structure and looks for signification within the structure. Supplementarity must go beyond structure, to consider supplementarity itself.[30] Thus deconstruction presumes standards of correctness or incorrectness in literary criticism, but it views the act of interpretation as an endless process.

The first task of a deconstructive study of Der Schimmelreiter - and especially of Der Schimmelreiter - is to determine the textual boundaries. Indeed the novella is a combination of distinct encapsulated subordinate narrations within the body of the text entitled Der Schimmelreiter. That the narrations, though they are fictionally

versed as the stories told by equally fictive characters are creations of the same author does not minimize their significance in the structure of the text. The major component is the legend of Hauke Haien, which is the plot of the novella. Within the legend, once we deconstruct its layers of narration but still take all of them into account, lies the originary meaning, that elusive solution to all the questions that continue to be raised about the text.

Yet the very content of Der Schimmelreiter provides a warning, as well as a hint, about the benefits of the deconstructive method. Legend always keeps the receiver (either reader or hearer) once removed from the subject. The reality of the subject is first altered by time and then by subsequent re-telling. In Der Schimmelreiter the legend is formed both by time and, what is really the same new narrative variations. Moreover, the legend's substratum is already infused with myth and superstition. Whatever differences exist between the "real" and the legendary Hauke Haien, the legend is our only source of information. It is possible to strip away some of the layers of legend which, we can see, have been formed by the attitudes or viewpoints of the storyteller. We can never reconstruct what really was. But we may deconstruct what we know to have been supplemented.

The mythical quality of a legend lies in its oral transmission from one generation to another. Some features may change through re-telling, but the legend remains basically the same. The story-teller brings the fading facts back to life, and he is responsilbe for keeping the legend intact. Once a legend is written down it becomes set and less likely to change. Although the historical facts have already been modified, the writing of a legend lends an aura of historicity.

In Der Schimmelreiter the written account of the legend is the magazine article based on the schoolmaster's version. With the magazine reader's rendition, the legend again enters the story-telling stage, where time and circumstance may have had effect.

Among so many who re-tell the legend, who, then, is the author? In the obvious and trivial sense, Theodor Storm is the author of Der Schimmelreiter, but there are other factors of authorship implied in the narrator's account. The schoolmaster excercises the author's right to decide how to tell the story. He makes somewhat of a compromise by deciding to leave the superstitions in his version. Occasionally he takes the authority to bring the superstition in line with his own thinking. This authority traditionally is not part of the narrator's purpose. His duty is to tell the story, and he is responsible for keeping it intact. The author, on the other hand, has the choice of using or discarding material, depending on his purposes. His duty is to create a story and to make it credible.

The schoolmaster leaves other traces of authorship in his narration. The story bears his signature; it could not have been recounted the same way by anyone else. We are indeed informed that Antje Vollmers would have "told it much differently."(8) The schoolmaster identifies himself with Hauke Haien, and as such becomes personally involved in the story and champions Hauke's achievement. These are elements of authorship that ultimately can be traced to Theodor Storm.

To Storm the oral tradition was very important in creating the desired effect in the novella. Even though the Enlightenment represented a new way of thinking, it would be incongruous to tell a folk legend from a consciously rationalistic standpoint.

Storm was expecially aware of the folk traditions of his Frisian homeland and of the supernatural in the beliefs and customs of the people.[31] It is almost as though Storm saw himself as the spokesman for the folk story and considered it potential literary material.

Storm used ghost stories to explore the irrational aspect of fate, which, Martini argues, is present in the reality of life.[32] Storm understood fate as an intangible irrationality in the world order, whose position belongs somewhere between delusion and truth, and for Storm there are elements of both in the folk myth or legend.[33]

The folk legend itself exists as an independent text and also as an integral part of Storm's version. We can find similar themes within the body of folk legend and also in literature. Whatever folkloric or literary influences inspired Storm, the Schimmelreiter legend as we have it is his version.

CHAPTER II

NARRATIVE STRUCTURE: COMPLEXITY AND AMBIGUITY AS FORMAL PRINCIPLES AND EXPRESSION OF THEME

I shall argue throughout my study that the combination of vagueness and precision, of temporal distance and subjective immediacy, of seeming realism and apparent supernaturalism is essential to the meaning of Der Schimmelreiter.

While the opening passage of any narration is vital to its effect on the reader, that of Der Schimmelreiter is especially striking. Critics have assigned a variety of functions to the narrative framework. Some claim that it objectifies the narration, creating distance between the reader and the material, while others propose that the frame draws the reader closer to the narrative text. The outermost framework in Der Schimmelreiter indeed captures the reader's curiosity and draws him into a sense of immediate observation. At the same time, the narrator's presence, emphasized by the frame structure, reminds the reader of his detachment from the narration. Storm presents the legend of Hauke Haien with a rather long introductory section which consists of two parts. The first refers to the legend only vaguely, but it extablishes an initial temporal reference. The first narrator, that is the "I" of the outermost narrative shell, explains that he read the account of Hauke Haien approximately fifty years earlier:

> Was ich zu berichten beabsichtige, ist mir vor reichlich einem halben Jahrhundert im Hause meiner Urgroßmutter, der alten Frau Senator Feddersen, kund geworden, während ich, an

> ihrem Lehnstuhl sitzend, mich mit dem Lesen eines in blaue Pappe eingebundenen Zeitschriftenheftes beschäftigte; ich vermag mich nicht mehr zu entsinnen, ob von den "Leipziger" oder von "Pappes Hamburger Lesefrüchten." Noch fühl ich es gleich einem Schauer, wie dabei die linde Hand der über Achtzigjährigen mitunter liebkosend über das Haupthaar ihres Urenkels hinglitt. Sie selbst und jene Zeit sind längst begraben; vergebens auch habe ich seitdem jenen Blättern nachgeforscht, und ich kann daher um so weniger weder die Wahrheit der Tatsachen verbürgen als, wenn jemand sie bestreiten wollte, dafür aufstehen; nur so viel kann ich versichern, daß ich sie seit jener Zeit, obgleich sie durch keinen äußeren Anlaß in mir aus neue belebt wurden, niemals aus dem Gedächtnis verloren habe. (1)

The story made a strong impression on the narrator, and therefore he earnestly intends to tell, or rather "report" it. Despite the rich circumstantial description of the boyhood experience, the reader senses a strange, tantalizing vagueness in certain features of the recollection. While some details are still very clear in the narrator's mind, others, curiously, have been forgotten. He still remembers his great-grandmother's presence, where he sat, even the blue cover of the periodical. The atmosphere of his surroundings and the touch of his grandmother's hand have remained in his memory as a part of his reading of the story. Yet the narrator does not remember the name of the magazine, although he has tried to find it out. He even declines to assert the veracity of the story, because he could not find the written account. He does not indicate what kind of a story it is: the novella's very first word is merely the vague pronoun "was." Nor does he say why he remembered the story except for its powerful but as yet undefined impact. It could appear initially that he tells the story because he remembers the circumstances of his reading it so vividly. It is an experience he must pass on, for reasons which are not stated here or later, but whose elucidation has now been made part of the

responsible and responsive reader's task in comprehending the narration.

Vital expressions in this first section give the narrative atmosphere an irrational, almost dreamlike quality: "Noch fühl ich es gleich einem Schauer." The suggestion that there is something ghostly or other-worldly about the story and its recollection is accompanied by a sense of its remoteness, almost as though it could have been a dream or a figment of the narrator's imagination.

By giving information about how much time has passed, the introductory or "external" narrator risks eliciting the reader's skepticism. On the other hand the reader has the choice of abandoning his objectivity through the convention often characterized by, "long, long ago and far, far away." This narrator tells the story from a conviction that the receiver will also be affected by the tale. Any doubts that are initially present will disappear as the story unfolds and takes effect.

The tantalizing combination of realistic detail and puzzling allusion continues. Additional references to events in Hauke's life make it possible to deduce still more accurately, or at least in another manner the date of the dike's construction. We are told by the schoolmaster that Hauke's daughter is still a child at the time of the fateful storm in 1756. Wienke was born approximately eight years after Hauke and Elke's marriage took place: "Inzwischen hatte im Hause des Deichgrafen sich ein frohes Ereignis vorbereitet: im neunten Ehejahre war noch ein Kind geboren worden." The following year the dike neared completion. The dike therefore must have been completed in the mid- or late 1740s.

The frequent chronological cues, which lend a sense of historical accuracy to the narration, are nevertheless scattered and lack clear reference to one another. If the dike was complete in the 1740s, the schoolmaster's dating of the dike is inaccurate. There may be logical reasons for such a discrepancy, such as a natural tendency to round off figures, common to much normal discourse and certainly to the transmission of legend. Though this problem may actually be fairly insignificant, it shows the reader how futile it is to attempt a clarification of the facts. We cannot know at what point in the narrative framework the temporal discrepancy enters. It may be that the magazine author miscalculated the time when he met the schoolmaster and heard the story. His allusion to the "third decade of our century" is a vital but confusing reference point for reckoning backwards in time. More likely, the problem can be traced back to the man who, as a boy, read the magazine account. The frame structure does not close with a return to him, and therefore, he cannot take responsibility for any problems in the narration. But for one exception, those who are involved in the story as narrators, as listeners, or as both, seem satisfied with the level of exactness of the temporal indicators, -- perhaps, it would appear in some instances, because they are intimately familiar with the story. The exception is the reader of the novella, and I think the dual mood of certainty and uncertainty is essential to the simultaneous fascinated credulity and skepticism which accompany the reading of this novella until the very end. Storm creates a narrative atmosphere that initially captures and continues to hold the reader's attention without requiring the reader totally to sacrifice his critical perception.

The juxtaposition of vagueness and explicitness is carried out in

the way Storm (or rather the fictive narrators who transmit the story) refer to time. Their remarks establish a chain of temporal points and intervals which one can plot backwards in time and thus determine approximately when the legend originated. The first temporal reference, "a good fifty years ago," takes the reader back fifty or more years to about 1837 or some what earlier, if we can indeed assume the present time of the outermost narrative frame to be 1888, the year that Der Schimmelreiter was completed. The next allusion to time is provided by the author of the magazine article:

> Es war im dritten Jahrzehnt unseres Jahrhunderts, an einem Oktobernachmittag . . . als ich bei starkem Unwetter auf einem nordfriesischen Deich entlangritt.(1)

The narrator is apparently speaking of an experience which occurred in the 1820s the third decade of the century, although he avoids naming the century. A little further on he, the novella's narrator, and we ourselves learn that the dike has been rebuilt in the previous century: "unser Hauptdeich ist schon im vorigen Jahrhundert umgelegt." Again no precise date is given, either year or century.

The local schoolmaster, who recounts the legend to the writer of the magazine article, is the source of the next reference:

> "In der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts, oder vielmehr, um genauer zu bestimmen, vor und nach derselben, gab es hier einen Deichgrafen, der von Deich- und Sielsachen mehr verstand, als Bauern und Hofbesitzer sonst zu verstehen pflegen."(9)

This is the first explicit reference to a historical figure, who, according to the schoolmaster, lived sometime during the previous mid-century, presumably somewhere between 1720 and 1760. Later in the narration, in fact almost at its end, the schoolmaster gives a specific date, one which falls in the period of a year or less between the

completion of the dike and Hauke Haien's death; for the first time a definite numerical date is provided:

> "Das Jahr, von dem ich Ihnen erzähle," sagte nach einer Weile mein Gastfreund, der Schulmeister, "war das Jahr 1756, das in dieser Gegend nie vergessen wird; im Hause Hauke Haiens brachte es eine Tote."(129)

The storm which brings Hauke Haien's end occurs in the same year; from the events in the narration and the references to holidays and seasons it cannot take place much later than a year after Trin' Jans' death. The last reference, which clarifies dates, is that of the age of the dike: "Aber der Hauke-Haien-Deich steht noch jetzt nach hundert Jahren."(144)

The juxtaposition of precision and vagueness in temporal indicators is only one of the many ambiguities or paradoxes in Der Schimmelreiter. Such ambiguities are important because they are an inherent part of a legend; facts are maintained in a state of questionable reality. The temporal problem leads to the question whether we can or even must know when the actual Hauke Haien lived, who he really was, and what he did. We do not have any absolutly reliable facts with which to answer those questions. We might well conclude, then, as does John Ellis, that it is not the real Hauke Haien who is all-important, but rather the legend itself and whose who transmit it:

> The whole frame, with all its narrators needs to be examined; between us and the "real" events of the story or the "real" people there is a broad barrier involving many different perspectives.[1]

The frame in the narration has an objectifying function. The subject matter is drawn out of its context and observed through the narrator's perspective. Especially in the novella, the focus on one person or event excludes comparative background material.

According to Fritz Martini, the distancing of the material only creates an illusion of objectivity, since the narrator composes the tale in keeping with his own personal interest and from his own viewpoints. For Hermand the objectifying function of the framework allows the author more freedom to communicate his point to the reader, because the reader stands back from the action and from the character:

> Auch er soll nicht von nah betrachtet werden, sondern aus respektvoller Entfernung, durch Rahmen und Historie ins Monumentale gesteigert, so daß sich das kleinteilig Verworrene zu scharfgeschnittenen Konturen klärt.[2]

The same kind of paradox exists in the distancing function of the frame as with its objectifying purpose. Through a frame made up of three individual narrators, Storm removes the reader three times from the legend. He reinforces the distance between reader and legend by narrative interruptions. Yet despite Ellis' "broad barrier," Storm nevertheless succeeds in involving the reader in the transmission of the legend.

There are three narrators, one who has been asked, the other two self-appointed who transmit the original legend to the actual reader of Storm's text. To avoid confusion, they will be labeled "article reader" (the reader of the magazine article), "article writer" and "schoolmaster" (who first tells the tale, which is then virtually quoted by the other two). The article reader is the furthest removed from the legend. He states no explicit purpose for telling the story, and his cautious tone of narration leads us to assume that he brings with him no biases which might lead him to add or delete information. The only direct information he adds is his recollection of reading the legend. He also informs us that he will recount the story purely from

memory. The article reader makes no value judgments and states no didactic purposes for telling the story. Supposedly we are receiving the version he has read; in this sense his narration would be termed objective. Yet fifty years will have made a difference. The article reader believes he can quote the entire article from memory, and yet because he admits the problem we are not likely to believe him completely. Storm again places the reader in a paradoxical situation.

After introducing the narration of the article writer, "so begann der damalige Erzähler," the article reader never again appears in the narrative structure. His implied role as narrator, the fictive person through whom we receive the legend, is largely ignored in discussions of the frame structure and narrative. The reader may also tend to forget that it is the article reader who is the last link in the transmission of the legend. I will subsequently argue, however, that the "closed" frame structure is actually left open to include Der Schimmelreiter readers in ongoing reinterpretations of the legend.

The article reader brings the legend back to the level of oral tradition, where it began, not merely with the schoolmaster, but with those who first created and transmitted the legend. But before we can study the legend as an oral tradition we must first examine the written account of the article writer. This narrator is fascinated by the legend of Hauke Haien. He is an outsider who probably would not have cared about the superstitious legends of the Frisian people but for his own recent and rather disturbing encounter with the nocturnal horseman. The article writer, traveling on the dike in the dark, was overtaken by a mysterious rider. The only circumstances which should have unsettled

the writer are the dark of the night and the dangers which a storm on a dike may pose. The apparition is therefore all the more mysterious:

> Jetzt aber kam auf dem Deich etwas gegen mich heran; ich hörte nichts; aber immer deutlicher, wenn der halbe Mond ein karges Licht herabließ, glaubte ich eine dunkle Gestalt zu erkennen, und bald, da sie näher kam, sah ich es, sie saß auf einem Pferde, einem hochbeinigen hageren Schimmel; ein dunkler Mantel flatterte um ihre Schultern, und im Vorbeifliegen sahen mich zwei brennende Augen aus einem bleichen Antlitz an.
> Wer war das? Was wollte der? - Und jetzt fiel mir bei, ich hatte keinen Hufschlag, kein Keuchen des Pferdes vernommen; und Roß und Reiter waren doch hart an mir vorbeigefahren!
> In Gedanken darüber ritt ich weiter, aber ich hatte nicht lange Zeit zum Denken, schon fuhr es von rückwärts wieder an mir vorbei; mir war, als streifte mich der fliegende Mantel, und die Erscheinung war, wie das erste Mal, lautlos an mir vorübergestoben. Dann sah ich sie fern und ferner vor mir; dann war's, als säh ich plötzlich ihren Schatten an der Binnenseite des Deiches hinuntergehen.(5)

The writer seems unsure of what he has seen, although he describes it in vivid detail. He is struck by an uncanny feeling when he realizes that he had heard nothing.

While perhaps doubting his perception, and certainly pondering the improbability of the figure, the article writer sees the specter again, which only confirms his first impressions. His curiosity about the figure on the horse increases when he sees the reaction of the Deichgraf and the other people around him in the inn where he sits out the storm:

> Ich hatte begonnen, ihm meine seltsame Begegnung auf dem Deiche zu erzählen. Er wurde aufmerksam, und ich bemerkte plötzlich, daß alles Gespräch umher verstummt war. "Der Schimmelreiter!" rief einer aus der Gesellschaft, und eine Bewegung des Erschreckens ging durch die übrigen.
> Der Deichgraf war aufgestanden. "Ihr braucht nicht zu erschrecken," sprach er über den Tisch hin; "das ist nicht bloß für uns; Anno 17 hat es auch denen drüben gegolten; mögen sie auf alles vorgefaßt sein!"
> Mich wollte nachträglich ein Grauen überlaufen: "Verzeiht!" sprach ich, "was ist das mit dem Schimmelreiter?"(7)

The sudden attention paid him by all the other inn guests conveys to

the article writer the importance of his experience. He becomes aware that he has encountered something unusual, and a sudden feeling of fear has its belated impact. His curiosity aroused, he insists on hearing the tale complete with its superstitious elements:

> "Nun freilich," sagte der Alte, sich zu mir wendend, "will ich gern zu Willen sein; aber es ist viel Aberglaube dazwischen und eine Kunst, es ohne diesen zu erzählen."(9)

The schoolmaster would rather tell the story without including the superstition, but that element is essential for the story to be a legend. Contrary to the schoolmaster's bias and to his own ability as a story-teller, there is an art to transmitting the supernatural in the legend in not only a credible but realistic manner, so that the reader accepts the story despite any logical discrepancies it may contain. But of course true art is proverbially that which appears artless.

At this point the article writer knows nothing about the Schimmelreiter, except that he saw the figure. He knows nothing about the myth which surrounds the appearance of the apparition. For him the experience, though it was indeed mysterious, had no superstitious or mythical significance. But he knows now at least that the apparition was not caused by the power of suggestion. It is therefore important for him to understand its objective background.

Soon after the schoolmaster has begun his narration, after he has just told of strange sea monsters on the beach and Norwegian sea-ghost stories, a commotion occurs. The people in the inn turn to the window, through which they see the stormy night with its clouds creating light and shadow. The article writer thinks he sees more: "aber auch mir war es, als hätte ich den hageren Reiter auf seinem Schimmel vorbei-

sausen gesehen."(17) This time an element of doubt is injected into the account. It seems to the writer that he saw the quickly speeding figure. The second appearance of the specter is thus a suggested one because of the people around him, their belief in the figure's appearance and the legend now being told.

To the article writer, who is struggling to comprehend his experience, any appearances of the Schimmelreiter subsequent to the first one are important for purposes of comparison. The Schimmelreiter appears a third time and the article writer only hears about it:

> Ein starker Mann, den Südwester auf dem Kopf, war eingetreten. "Herr," sagte er, "wir beide haben es gesehen, Hans Nickels und ich: der Schimmelreiter hat sich in den Bruch gestürzt!"
> "Wo saht Ihr das?" frug der Deichgraf.
> -"Es ist ja nur die eine Wehle; in Jansens Fenne, wo der Hauke-Haien-Koog beginnt."
> "Saht Ihr's nur einmal?"
> -"Nur einmal; es war auch nur wie Schatten, aber es braucht drum nicht das erste Mal gewesen zu sein."
> Der Deichgraf war aufgestanden. "Sie wollen entschuldigen," sagte er, sich zu mir wendend, "wir müssen draußen nachsehn, wo das Unheil hin will!" Dann ging er mit dem Boten zur Tür hinaus; aber auch die übrige Gesellschaft brach auf und folgte ihm.
> Ich blieb mit dem Schullehrer allein in dem großen öden Zimmer; durch die unverhangenen Fenster, welche nun nicht mehr durch die Rücken der davor sitzenden Gäste verdeckt wurden, sah man frei hinaus, und wie der Sturm die dunklen Wolken über den Himmel jagte.(55)

Here it is possible for him to view the event objectively. He is indoors, safe from the storm, and from this location he finds it easy to remain skeptical while listening to others tell what they have seen. After all, this time it was someone else and not he himself who saw the phantom. He is disinclined to pursue the ghost. It was only like shadows, similar to the dark clouds chasing across the sky, which so often suggest various images to the creative imagination. The article

the story from his own perspective. Since the article writer has insisted that he can differentiate the "wheat from the chaff," and perhaps because the legend is incomplete without the irrational elements, the schoolmaster compromises and abandons his own version in favor of a mixed version.

The schoolmaster begins his narration after agreeing to include the superstitions. He adds local history and references to the area's most famous intellect, the nineteenth century historian, Theodor Mommsen. Occasionally the narrative continuity is interrupted by others; sometimes the schoolmaster interrupts himself to give an explanation which he considers necessary.(10) After the description of some creatures which Hauke has seen and taken to be some kind of sea monster, the schoolmaster jumps ahead to the adult Hauke Haien and the rational explanation which Hauke gave his child. To this narrative interruption he appends an interjection of his own:

> "Weiß Gott, Herr!" unterbrach sich der Schulmeister, "es gibt auf Erden allerlei Dinge, die ein ehrlich Christenherz verwirren können; aber der Hauke war weder ein Narr noch ein Dummkopf."(16)

Such a personal judgment reveals some of the schoolmaster's own opinion of Hauke Haien. It is clear that his "calm objectivity" is tainted by personal convictions and opinions.

The break in narration extends through the supposed second appearance of the Schimmelreiter outside the window. The schoolmaster continues the narration with an episode that signals Hauke Haien's entry into apprenticeship on the Deichgraf's farm. Jost Hermand breaks the biographical information into Hauke Haien's developmental goals.[6] The narrative breaks may be interpreted to have such an effect on the

biographical account. The second such narrative break, we note, is inserted just before Hauke's appointment as Deichgraf, the third introduces the Hauke-Schimmel myth and the dike-building project, while the last narrative break signals Hauke's death and the concluding natural catastrophes and storm.

The second narrative break occurs when Hans Nickels and the man with a sou'wester enter the inn with their report of the specter's third appearance. The passage was quoted and discussed and after all have left, the article writer and schoolmaster retire to the narrator's room to continue the story. At this point in the narrative, Hauke Haien's father has died and Hauke is just taking over the inherited property. At the schoolmaster's next interruption, Hauke Haien has become Deichgraf, largely as a result of his marriage to the former Deichgraf's daughter, Elke. The next part of the narration is important for the superstitions surrounding the horse. Because Hauke Haien's purchase of the Schimmel signals the beginning of Hauke's mythification, the schoolmaster finds it necessary to distance himself from the generally-held beliefs of the people:

> "Sie wollen bemerken, lieber Herr," unterbrach der Schulmeister seine Erzählung, mich freundlich mit seinen feinen Augen fixierend, "daß ich das bisher Berichtete während meiner fast vierzigjährigen Wirksamkeit in diesem Kooge aus den Überlieferungen verständiger Leute oder aus Erzählungen der Enkel und Urenkel solcher zusammengefunden habe; was ich, damit Sie dieses mit dem endlichen Verlauf in Einklang zu bringen vermögen, Ihnen jetzt vorzutragen habe, das war derzeit und ist auch jetzt noch das Geschwätz des ganzen Marschdorfes, sobald nur um Allerheiligen die Spinnräder an zu schnurren fangen."(74-75)

At this point, then, the schoolmaster must introduce the attitudes of the people, and from here on the narration begins to reflect a different bias than that of the schoolmaster's rational perspective.

His conscious shift of emphasis suggests more than an added perspective:

> To the bias of the rationalist narrator, then, a bias which is in any case not inherently consistent, we must add the bias of his anti-rationalist sources; . . . we really have not three narrators, but four: the implied fourth is the people of the district.[7]

The legend already has become a folk-tale by the time the schoolmaster receives it, and he must transmit it without separating the legend from its superstitious elements. The 1756 villagers have formed the story he tells through word of mouth. They have built superstition into the legend which in turn becomes a part of their lives.[8] Nevertheless, the schoolmaster, who is well-educated, cannot share their beliefs, and he does not experience the legend with its irrational components, especially that of a reappearing ghost. After one short additional interruption to insert a significant date, the schoolmaster ends the narrative with a few remarks expressing his opinion of Hauke Haien as a legendary figure who was misunderstood by his contemporaries. Among the schoolmaster's comments there is one objective statement about Hauke Haien's achievement: "Aber der Hauke-Haien-Deich steht noch jetzt nach hundert Jahren." No one can deny that, least of all his listener, the article writer, to whom we again return for an equally objective statement:

> --Am andern Morgen, beim goldensten Sonnenlichte, das über einer weiten Verwüstung aufgegangen war, ritt ich über den Hauke-Haien-Deich zur Stadt hinunter.(146)

The dike's existence is undeniable. The destruction ("einer weiten Verwüstung") of the night before, though now calmly viewed on a sunlit morning, is a reminder of the encounter with the Schimmelreiter, which is also undeniably a part of his memory. The people, whom we may

consider to constitute an intervening narrator, view the article writer's experience as yet another recurrence of the Schimmelreiter legend, a legend which has grown out of the "repository of superstition."[9]

CHAPTER III

THE EVOLUTION OF LEGEND: SUPERNATURAL, RITUAL AND MYTH

I will argue that the conceptual basis for the Schimmelreiter legend as found in supernaturalism, ritual and myth is the place where "originary" meaning occurs; the paradoxes which we find there are significant to our interpretation of Der Schimmelreiter, but also to our interpretation of broader social legend.

The focus of narration in Der Schimmelreiter is a legend, as legends indeed have an ambiguous ontological status, which is an integral part of the work. As Silz suggests, the opposition of rational and irrational within the narration represents Storm's world view.[1] For his own part the schoolmaster has no room in his "Weltanschauung" for the irrational, but he must include it, primarily because he is the chief and innermost narrator, whose responsibility is to the legend he tells. The irrational is the element which makes a legend out of an historic event. In this narration the irrational, as Stuckert points out, creates the mythic atmosphere of the material.[2] Despite the schoolmaster's attempt to separate himself personally from the superstitious attitudes of the people, he has had to recognize their perspective in community life, and must make it a part of his narrative also. The Schimmelreiter legend grew out of the daily experiences of the community: the supernaturalism in which they believe, the ritualism which they practice, and the myths which they form as a

representation of their world view. These three elements deserve careful "deconstructive" interpretation.

As the title suggests, animals are part of the legend of Hauke Haien. Indeed throughout the narrative, they often become objects of supernatural belief. That Hauke's horse is not in isolated instance of supernaturalism makes it all the more credible, more realistic, within the confines of the fiction. The people attribute unnatural characteristics to creatures which are perceived as somehow different from the norm in nature.

Fear of the unknown, then, and a reliance on common superstition as explanation for it characterize the local people. Initially, Hauke Haien himself is affected by a belief in supernatural elements within nature. As an early experience makes clear in immense detail:

> "An einem der nächsten Abende war er wiederum da draußen. Auf jenen Stellen war jetzt das Eis gespalten; wie Rauchwolken stieg es aus den Rissen, und über das ganze Watt spann sich ein Netz von Dampf und Nebel, das sich seltsam mit der Dämmerung des Abends mischte. Hauke sah mit starren Augen darauf hin; denn in dem Nebel schritten dunkle Gestalten auf und ab, sie schienen ihm so groß wie Menschen. Würdevoll, aber mit seltsamen, erschreckenden Gebärden; mit langen Nasen und Hälsen sah er sie fern an den rauchenden Spalten auf und ab spazieren; plötzlich begannen sie wie Narren unheimlich auf und ab zu springen, die großen über die kleinen und die kleinen gegen die großen; dann breiteten sie sich aus und verloren alle Form."
>
> 'Was wollen die? Sind es die Geister der Ertunkenen?' dachte Hauke. 'Hoiho!' schrie er laut in die Nacht hinaus; aber die draußen kehrten sich nicht an seinen Schrei, sondern trieben ihr wunderliches Wesen fort.
>
> Da kamen ihm die furchtbaren norwegischen Seegespenster in den Sinn, von denen ein alter Kapitän ihm einst erzählt hatte, die statt des Angesichts einen stumpfen Pull von Seegras auf dem Nacken tragen; aber er lief nicht fort, sondern bohrte die Hacken seiner Stiefel fest in den Klei des Deiches und sah starr dem possenhaften Unwesen zu, das in der einfallenden Dämmerung vor seinen Augen fortspielte. 'Seid ihr auch hier bei uns?' sprach er mit harter Stimme; 'ihr sollt mich nicht vertreiben!'

> Erst als die Finsternis alles bedeckte, schritt er steifen, langsamen Schrittes heimwärts. Aber hinter ihm drein kam es wie Flügelrauschen und hallendes Geschrei. Er sah nicht um; aber er ging auch nicht schneller und kam erst spät nach Hause; doch niemals soll er seinem Vater oder einem andern davon erzählt haben.(15-16)

Hauke's ability to observe things analytically and objectively has temporarily been suspended. He is transfixed. His shouts are meant less to scare the creatures off than to assure himself that he is not dreaming. The only explanation for the phantoms that comes to Hauke's mind is an old sea story about strange sea monsters. Even if Hauke should believe that explanation, he refuses to be frightened off by what he sees. As if ashamed of the experience, Hauke tells no one of it. He would not admit to anyone, that he had no explanation for the creatures.

Only later, as an adult, does he express a rational explanation, which he did not think of while he watched:

> Erst viele Jahre später hat er sein blödes Mädchen, womit später der Herrgott ihn belastete, um dieselbe Tages- und Jahreszeit mit sich auf den Deich hinausgenommen, und dasselbe Wesen soll sich derzeit draußen auf den Watten gezeigt haben; aber er hat ihr gesagt, sie solle sich nicht fürchten, das seien nur die Fischreiher und die Krähen, die im Nebel so groß und fürchterlich erschienen; die holten sich die Fische aus den offenen Spalten.(16)

By clarifying the uncertainties surrounding the mysterious beings, which he saw, Hauke eliminates the supernatural element. Once he sees the creatures for what they really are, it is impossible for him to understand them by admitting other irrational observations or supernatural traits to understand them. Somewhere during his maturation Hauke's world view changed from one which might include superstitious beliefs to one which examined the world around him from a rational standpoint. As he grows up, Hauke changes. The change contributes

to his isolation from the community and paradoxically, contributes to his ultimate mythical status.

The reader experiences the phantoms and comes to understand their natural explanation much as Hauke does. It would be difficult if not impossible, to recognize them as birds solely from the description of the mysterious shapes in the first passage. They are magnified to superhuman size with long necks and noses. Their movement is also surreal, and does not suggest what the figures might be. The sea ghosts, to which Hauke compares them, seem to have almost human form, though Hauke does not describe more than a growth of seaweed on their necks where face and head should be - an interesting, macabre, and realistic detail. Both the figures on the beach and the sea ghosts, by their manner of description, fit no natural category of living creatures.

The way in which Hauke perceives the birds results from previous events which have a distinct legendary feature. Hauke had overheard a woman tell about the recovery of human bodies from the sea:

> "Im Februar bei dauerndem Frostwetter wurden angetriebene Leichen aufgefunden; draußen am offenen Haf auf den gefrorenen Watten hatten sie gelegen. Ein junges Weib, die dabeigewesen war, als man sie in das Dorf geholt hatte, stand redselig vor dem alten Haien: 'Glaubt nicht, daß sie wie Menschen aussahen,' rief sie; 'nein, wie die Seeteufel! So große Köpfe,' und sie hielt die ausgespreizten Hände von weitem gegeneinander, 'gnidderschwarz und blank, wie frischgebacken Brot! Und die Krabben hatten sie angeknabbert; und die Kinder schrien laut, als sie sie sahen!'
>
> Dem alten Haien war so was just nicht Neues: 'Sie haben wohl seit November schon in See getrieben!' sagte er gleichmütig."(14-15)

While the topic of her discourse may be repulsive, it does not inherently involve the supernatural. Nevertheless the old woman (or rather Storm) insistently injects the element of the supernatural into

her words and tone. The technique suggests that everyone involved in the narrations - the old woman, the intervening narrators and Storm himself - is distinctly fascinated by the supernatural. Perhaps the elder Haien alone does not share that fascination, but Hauke is not immune to it. While he, and Storm, remain "silent" about the effect of the old woman's description, the spare, factual account of events which follows the anecdote leaves little doubt that Hauke is susceptible to the supernatural: "'Hauke stand schweigend daneben; aber sobald er konnte, schlich er sich auf den Deich hinaus . . .'" Hauke is curious, but in a way of his own. For him the dike is a place of refuge from the irrational talk of the people, and it is there, where he seems to think most clearly and to get inspiration for his ideas. Even a few days after hearing such a gruesome description of nature's destruction, Hauke's mind is filled with thoughts of the dead. He wonders if the beings might be spirits of the departed. Thus, Hauke remembers the sea ghosts about which he had heard. Such beings appear after death at sea, where we note, the human spirit has not been properly put to rest.

The sea itself appears as a prominent supernatural motif throughout the legend. Almost universally the sea is attributed the capacity for generating supernatural life through its power of death. That is what Hauke Haien believed as a youth, when he saw the strange figures on the beach. The creatures he observed and thought of as supernatural were actually living, natural beings. Similarly, the supernatural traits attributed to Hauke Haien's horse have their origin in a real horse skeleton lying on the beach. The relevant passages deserve lengthy examination, since here lies the genesis of the Schimmelreiter

The portrayal of the steed begins with a distinctly factual tone, which only magnifies the ultimate effect of the supernatural content it conveys:

> "Von der Hofstelle des Deichgrafen, etwa fünf- bis sechshundert Schritte weiter nordwärts, sah man derzeit, wenn man auf dem Deiche stand, ein paar tausend Schritt ins Wattenmeer hinaus und etwas weiter von dem gegenüberliegenden Marschufer entfernt eine kleine Hallig, die sie 'Jeverssand,' auch 'Jevershallig' nannten.. . . An Mondhellen Abenden sah man vom Deiche aus nur die Nebeldünste leichter oder schwerer darüber hinziehen. Ein paar weißgebleichte Knochengerüste ertrunkener Schafe und das Gerippe eines Pferdes, von dem freilich niemand begriff, wie es dort hingekommen sei, wollte man, wenn der Mond von Osten auf die Hallig schien, dort auch erkennen können." (75)

Three elements common to local explanations of the supernatural are implied here. The skeletons symbolize death. The presence of the sea and its power is suggested by the location, the island. The third element which is conducive to belief in the supernatural is the presence of an unexplained factor; no one knows where the horse skeleton came from. Speculation about that subject leads to further questions and may result in either rational, naturalistic answers or irrational, supernatural explanations.

Hauke Haien told no one about his experience and later, perhaps by himself, found the answer which was acceptable to him: an answer based on reason, on natural causation. In similar circumstances, Hauke Haien's farmhand and another servant come to differing conclusions, which typify very well the two views of the supernatural which recur in Der Schimmelreiter.

> "Es war zu Ende März, als an dieser Stelle nach Feierabend der Tagelöhner aus dem Tede-Haienschen Hause und Iven Johns, der Knecht des jungen Deichgrafen, nebeneinanderstanden und unbeweglich nach der im trüben Mondduft kaum erkennbaren Hallig hinüberstarrten; etwas Auffälliges schien sie dort so

festzuhalten. Der Tagelöhner steckte die Hände in die Tasche und schüttelte sich: 'Komm, Iven,' sagte er, 'das ist nichts Gutes; laß uns nach Haus gehen!'

Der andere lachte, wenn auch ein Grauen bei ihm hindurchklang: 'Ei was, es ist eine lebige Kreatur, eine große! Wer, zum Teufel, hat sie nach dem Schlickstück hinaufgej gt! Sieh nur, nun reckt's den Hals zu uns hinüber! Nein, es senkt den Kopf; es frißt! Ich dächt', es wär' dort nichts zu fressen! Was es nur sein mag?'

'Was geht das uns an!' entgegnete der andere. 'Gute Nacht, Iven, wenn du nicht mitwillst; ich gehe nach Haus!'

-'Ja, ja; du hast ein Weib, du kommst ins warme Bett! Bei mir ist auch in meiner Kammer lauter Märzenluft!'

'Gut Nacht denn!' rief der Tagelöhner zurück, während er auf dem Deich nach Hause trabte. Der Knecht sah sich ein paarmal nach dem Fortlaufenden um; aber die Begier, Unheimliches zu schauen, hielt ihn noch fest." (76)

At this point, Iven Johns really knows nothing about what he sees, other than that the creature is alive, "eine lebige Kreatur." He wonders what it is and where it came from. The creature provokes fearful responses. The hired man, who intuitively feels there is something evil about what they see, does not wish to know more about the creature creature. Iven Johns, though curious enough to stay and observe the further, is frightened; fear pervades his laughter. The "Unheimliches," which taken literally means "something unfamiliar," is at the same time sinister in its strangeness.

Iven Johns has no explanations for the apparition. The creature raises questions in his mind and attracts his fascination. Although summoned by a servant boy to return to the Deichgraf, Iven Johns stays awhile longer, his attention focused solely on the strange unknown creature:

"Der Knecht hatte die Augen schon wieder nach der Hallig: 'Gleich; ich komme gleich!' sagte er.

'Wonach guckst du denn so?' frug der Junge.

Der Knecht hob den Arm und wies stumm nach der Hallig. 'Oha!' flüsterte der Junge; 'da geht ein Pferd - ein Schimmel -, das muß der Teufel reiten - wie kommt ein Pferd

nach Jevershallig?'
-'Weiß nicht, Carsten; wenn's nur ein richtiges Pferd ist!'
'Ja, ja, Iven; sieh nur, es frißt ganz wie ein Pferd! Aber wer hat's dahin gebracht; wir haben im Dorf so große Böte har nicht! Vielleicht auch ist es nur ein Schaf; Peter Ohm sagt, im Mondschein wird aus sehn Torfringeln ein ganzes Dorf. Nein, sieh! Nun springt es - es muß doch ein Pferd sein!'" (76-77)

Iven Johns has said nothing about what he is watching. He only points at the creature. Carsten, without a moment's hesitation, states that it is a horse and thereupon decides that the devil must ride it. He gives his own answer to the question of the horse's origin; for him there is no other possible explanation. Iven, still a little skeptical, is nevertheless uncertain that it is actually a horse: "Wenn's nur ein richtiges Pferd ist!" "Richtig" may mean "real" but it may also suggest that he is not sure that everything is right about this horse. There is something strange to him about the whole matter. Carsten continues to point out the characteristics of a horse which are consistent with the creature's appearance. He seems sure of his opinion. Again mentioning the problem of how the horse got there, Carsten becomes unsure of his judgment. It may be Iven's reluctance to accept a hasty explanation that causes Carsten to question his own interpretation. He conceded that it may be a sheep, since things are not always as they seem in the moonlight. Then, once again abandoning any doubts, he decides that the creature is a horse, after all. Carsten commits himself initially, then wavers and finally returns to his original explanation.

Iven Johns, on the other hand, is still unsure, and is willing to give the matter more consideration:

Beide standen eine Weile schweigend, die Augen nur nach dem gerichtet, was sie drüben undeutlich vor sich gehen sahen. Der Mond stand hoch am Himmel und beschien das weite

> Wattenmeer, das eben in der steigenden Flut seine Wasser über die glitzernden Schlickflächen zu spülen begann. Nur das leise Geräusch des Wassers, keine Tierstimme war in der ungeheueren Weite hier zu hören; auch in der Marsch, hinter dem Deiche, war es leer; Kühe und Rinder waren alle noch in den Ställen. Nichts regte sich; nur was sie für ein Pferd, einen Schimmel, hielten, schien dort auf Jevershallig noch beweglich. 'Es wird Heller,' unterbrach der Knecht die Stille; 'ich sehe deutlich die weißen Schafgerippe schimmern!'
>
> 'Ich auch,' sagte der Junge und reckte den Hals; dann aber, als komme es ihm plötzlich, zupfte er den Knecht am Ärmel: 'Iven,' raunte er, 'das Pferdgerippe, das sonst dabeilag, wo ist es? Ich kann's nicht sehen!'
>
> 'Ich seh es auch nicht! Seltsam!' sagte der Knecht.
>
> -'Nicht so seltsam, Iven! Mitunter, ich weiß nicht in welchen Nächten, sollen die Knochen sich erheben und tun, als ob sie lebig wären!'
>
> 'So?' machte der Knecht; 'das ist ja Altweiberglaube!'
>
> 'Kann sein, Iven,' meinte der Junge.
>
> 'Aber, ich mein, du sollst mich holen; komm, wir müssen nach Haus! Es bleibt hier immer doch dasselbe.'" (77-78)

After agreeing to return the following evening to investigate further, Iven Johns and Carsten go home. Iven has reasons for his non-committal attitude. What they are watching is not clearly visible. When the moonlight becomes brighter, Iven ventures the confident observation, "ich sehe deutlich die weißen Schafgerippe schimmern!" He is only sure of the sheep skeletons. When Iven and Carsten realize that the other bones are not there, Iven indeed comments that it is strange, but he makes no further statements. Carsten, again, is quick to provide a non-rational reason for the occurrence which he nevertheless seems to think is not out of the ordinary. He cites an event that takes place occasionally, an event which Iven considers to be nothing more than superstition. They leave to go home without a clear agreement between them about the mysterious apparition. The ambiguity they represent is indeed characteristic of the status of the supernatural in legend generally, and in Der Schimmelreiter in particular.

But Storm and his narrators do not drop the matter here. The next night, Iven Johns and Carsten arrive at the same location:

> "Der Mond stand, wie gestern, am Osthimmel und schien klar aus seiner Höhe. Bald waren beide wieder draußen auf dem Deich und sahen hinüber nach Jevershallig, die wie ein Nebelfleck im Wasser stand. 'Da geht es wieder,' sagte der K Knecht; 'nach Mittag war ich hier, da war's nicht da; aber ich sah deutlich das weiße Pferdsgerippe liegen!'
> Der Junge reckte den Hals: 'Das ist jetzt nicht da, Iven,' flüsterte er."(75)

According to Iven, the skeleton was visible during the day, but now it has disappeared, as Carsten observes. If the same thing should occur as had in the previous night, the horse should now appear:

> "Drüben aber war es, als hebe, was dorten ging, den Hals und recke gegen das Festland hin den Kopf. Sie sahen es nicht mehr; sie gingen schon den Deich hinab und bis zur Stelle, wo das Boot gelegen war. 'Nun, steig nur ein!' sagte der Knecht, nachdem er es losgebunden hatte. 'Ich bleib, bis du zurück bist! Zu Osten mußt du anlegen; da hat man immer landen können!' Und der Junge nickte schweigend und fuhr mit seiner Peitsche in die Mondnacht hinaus; der Knecht wanderte unterm Deich zurück und bestieg ihn wieder an der Stelle, wo sie vorhin gestanden hatten. Bald sah er, wie drüben bei einer schroffen, dunkeln Stelle, an die ein breiter Priel hinanführte, das Boot sich beilegte und eine untersetzte Gestalt daraus ans Land sprang. - War's nicht, als klatschte der Junge mit seiner Peitsche? Aber es konnte auch das Geräusch der steigenden Flut sein. Mehrere hundert Schritte nordwärts sah er, was sie für einen Schimmel angesehen hatten; und jetzt! - ja, die Gestalt des Jungen kam gerade darauf zugegangen. Nun hob es den Kopf, als ob es stutzte; und der Junge - es war deutlich zu hören - klatschte mit der Peitsche. Aber - was fiel ihm ein? er kehrte um, er ging den Weg zurück, den er gekommen war. Das drüben schien unablässig forzuweiden, kein Wiehern war von dort zu hören gewesen; wie weiße Wasserstreifen schien es mitunter über die Erscheinung hinzuziehen. Der Knecht sah wie gebannt hinüber.(79-80)

The horse figure, seemingly raising its head, has replaced the skeleton. The rest of this part of the account is related from Iven John's perspective. Again, his open-mindedness is apparent. He is willing to consider more than one possible explanation for the origin of the

sounds; they reverberate either from the boy's whip, or from the water. Then he observes the movement of the horse, and this time distinctly hears the whip snap. He is disappointed when the boy cuts short his investigation and returns to the mainland. Iven is confounded that the boy would turn away when he was so close to discovering the true nature of the horse.

It turns out that the boy has not seen the same things which Iven Johns has observed. Carsten is puzzled when, after he has returned, he can see the specter again:

> "'Dort, siehst du etwas, Carsten?'
> -'Wahrhaftig, da geht's ja wieder!'
> 'Wieder?' sagte der Knecht; 'ich hab die ganze Zeit hinübergeschaut, aber es ist gar nicht fortgewesen; du gingst ja gerade auf das Unwesen los!'
> Der Junge starrte ihn an; ein Entsetzen lag plötzlich auf seinem sonst so kecken Angesicht, das auch dem Knechte nicht entging. 'Komm!' sagte dieser, 'wir wollen nach Haus: von hier aus geht's wie lebig, und drüben liegen nur Knochen - das ist mehr, als du und ich begreifen können. Schweig aber still davon, man darf dergleichen nicht verreden!'" (80-81)

It is ironic that Iven Johns, who has fewer preconceptions about this phenomenon than does Carsten, did not take the initiative in the investigation and go to the island himself. He, who is not superstitious, continues to see a moving, living creature from afar, while Carsten, whose mind is made up before he takes any time to think of other possible answers, becomes almost convinced that there is actually nothing to the horse figure:

> "'Nichts war es!' sagte er. 'Noch kurz vom Boot aus hatt' ich es gesehen; dann aber, als ich auf der Hallig war - weiß der Henker, wo sich das Tier verkrochen hatte, der Mond schien doch hell genug; aber als ich an die Stelle kam, war nichts da als die bleichen Knochen von einem halben Dutzend Schafen, und etwas weiter lag auch das Pferdsgerippe mit seinem weißen, langen Schädel und ließ den Mond in seine leeren Augenhöhlen scheinen!'

'Hm!' meinte der Knecht; 'hast du auch recht zugesehen?'
'Ja, Iven, ich stand dabei; ein gottvergessener Kiewiet, der hinter dem Gerippe sich zur Nachtruh' hingeduckt hatte, flog schreiend auf, daß ich erschrak und ein paarmal mit der Peitsche hintennach klatschte.'
'Und das war alles?'
'Ja, Iven; ich weiß nicht mehr.'" (80)

Carsten, upon seeing the movement once again, is confused and ready to believe anything. He seems to reason that if nature plays tricks, there must be something supernatural involved. The ambiguities lead him to adopt a supernatural explanation, which he has indeed espoused all along. Iven John accepts the ambiguities as a part of life which is beyond comprehension. He decides to remain silent about the experience; he has a respect for that which is beyond his understanding and would rather that the matter not be discussed and misconstrued by people who have had nothing to do with it.

Carsten cannot forget the experience on the dike. He is bothered by it, especially after Hauke Haien buys a horse which Carsten believes he recognizes. Iven Johns remains skeptical and offers a rational explanation to counter each of Carsten's excited claims:

"'Du, Iven!' sagte er endlich, 'weißt du, das Pferdsgeripp' auf Jeverssand!'
'Was ist damit?' frug der Knecht.
'Ja, Iven, was ist damit? Es ist gar nicht mehr da; weder Tages noch bei Mondschein; wohl zwanzigmal bin ich auf den Deich hinausgelaufen!'
'Die alten Knochen sind wohl zusammengepoltert?' sagte Iven und rauchte ruhig weiter.
'Aber ich war auch bei Mondschein draußen; es geht auch drüben nichts auf Jeverssand!'
'Ja,' sagte der Knecht, 'sind die Knochen auseinandergefallen, so wird's wohl nicht mehr aufstehen können!'
'Mach keinen Spaß, Iven! Ich weiß jetzt; ich kann dir sagen, wo es ist!'
Der Knecht drehte sich jäh zu ihm: 'Nun, wo ist es denn?'
'Wo?' wiederholte der Junge nachdrücklich. 'Es steht in unserem Stall; da steht's, seit es nicht mehr auf der

> Hallig ist. Es ist auch nicht umsonst, daß der Wirt es allzeit selber füttert; ich weiß Bescheid, Iven!'
> Der Knecht paffte eine Weile heftig in die Nacht hinaus. 'Du bist nicht klug, Carsten,' sagte er dann; 'unser Schimmel? Wenn je ein Pferd ein lebigs war, so ist is der! Wie kann so ein Allerweltsjunge wie du in solch Altemweiberglauben sitzen sitzen!'
> --Aber der Junge war nicht zu bekehren: wenn der Teufel in dem Schimmel steckte, warum sollte er dann nicht lebendig sein? Im Gegenteil, um desto schlimmer!"(86-87)

Carsten believes the superstition, whose basis is the supernatural trait of the horse: the devil incarnate in the resurrected horse. Such superstition requires a belief in the devil as a powerful being. Carsten's argument rests on his conviction that the devil gives life to the horse. The fact that Carsten is totally convinced of the horse's supernatural nature is an indication of the beliefs and practices common among the people of the area.

The language in the description of the mysterious skeletons contributes greatly to the supernatural aura which surrounds the event. For present purposes I will classify the language into four categories of vocabulary which: a) denotes sound or lack of it; b) designates clear or unclear sight; c) typifies supernatural phenomena or a questionable description; or d) suggests temporal immediacy. In this passage the auditory vocabulary indicates a lack of sound: "schweigend," "leise Geräusche," "nichts regte sich." Walter Silz suggests that the lack of sound creates an uncanny effect.[3] More specifically, it helps to remove the event from the realm of common everyday experience. The visual vocabulary fluctuates between clear and hazy sight: "undeutlich . . . sahen," "Der Mond stand hoch . . . und beschien," "'Es wird heller. . . .ich sehe deutlich,'" "'ich kann's nicht sehen.'" These descriptions constantly contradict each other. Though

the moon shines clearly, things are hazy; Iven Johns claims to see distinctly, while Carsten suddenly can no longer see what they both thought to have been in plain view. ("things are not as they seem" and the reader cannot judge what is real or not).

Other language reinforces the nebulous atmosphere, the aspect of "seeming": "was sie für ein Pferd . . . hielten," "schien . . . noch beweglich," "schimmern," "sollen die Knochen sich erheben," "'als ob sie lebig wären.'" Here verbs lend haziness and subjectivity. Subjunctive forms, and the use of the modal "sollen" strengthen the mythic mood. Although such verb forms cast a shadow of doubt upon the narrative, in combination with temporal adverbs the feeling of immediacy - of present reality is effected. The reader feels himself drawn into the event. Words interspersed throughout the narration like "eben, noch, dann aber, plötzlich," seem insignificant, except as fill words, and yet they involve the reader by making him feel that the event is happening in the presence of their reading. Even though the verbs are in past tense, the temporal adverbs cause the past action to be sensed as a present tense experience. Such use of language, especially where supernatural elements pervade an event, results in a narration which is more realistically perceived.

Not only does the use of language draw the reader into the narration; it provides a closer look at the people and the way they perceive the events. In the people's mind Hauke Haien has access to supernatural power through the horse: the relationship is equated to a pact with the devil. The belief in a supernatural bond between Hauke and the Schimmel is deeply pervaded by a fear that Hauke and his defiance of nature will have harmful consequences not only for him but

for the whole community. A feeling that the evil will be purged in a terrible way fills the villagers with foreboding. Hauke Haien senses the intimation of Trin' Jans' last words on her deathbed, and Storm quotes them in their original dialectal form:

> "Ihre knöchernen Arme streckten sich gegen die draußen flimmernde Meeresspiegelung: 'Hölp mi! Hölp mi! Du bist bawen Water...Gott gnad de annern!'
> Ihre Arme sanken, ein leises Krachen der Bettstatt wurde hörbar; sie hatte aufgehört zu leben. . . . In Haukes Innern aber klang schwer die letzte Rede der Sterbenden. 'Gott gnad de annern!' sprach es leise in ihm. 'Was wollte die alte Hexe? Sind denn die Sterbenden Propheten--?'"(130)

Hauke feels personally included in Trin' Jans' words. He wonders why he should need God's grace, and if Trin' Jans perhaps knew something he did not. Her words also apply to the people, who, already burdened by Hauke's dike plans, experience other great hardships for which they hold Hauke Haien responsible:

> "--Bald, nachdem Trin' Jans oben bei der Kirche eingegraben war, begann man immer lauter von allerlei Unheil und seltsamem Geschmeiß zu reden, das die Menschen in Nordfriesland erschreckt haben sollte: und sicher war es, am Sonntage Lätare war droben von der Turmspitze der goldne Hahn durch einen Wirbelwind herabgeworfen worden; auch das war richtig: im Hochsommer fiel, wie ein Schnee, ein groß Geschmeiß vom Himmel, daß man die Augen davor nicht auftun konnte und es hernach fast handhoch auf den Fennen lag, und hatte niemand je so was gesehen."(130)

Other rumoured events are recounted subsequently, but they are not firsthand reports. What is significant about this particular passage is its clarity of description and absence of mystery. The diction is folksy and reminds one of a local newspaper account or almanac article. Such events are likely to be reported in a local periodical, and are verifiable: "auch das war richtig."

The villagers interpret the occurences as a reaction of nature to an imbalance and an effort to restore equilibrium, which is, in a

way, a rational understanding. According to the people, Hauke's dike is the cause of the imbalance, and Hauke and his horse represent an opposition to the power of nature. By adding the factor of supernatural conflict to the natural explanation of the phenomena, the people create in the legend a paradoxical conception of nature vital to the development of legend.

The people's manner of thinking, their supernatural beliefs and folk religion are reflected in their customs and rituals, social formalizations of a world view which accepts the supernatural. In his study, Findlay divides the belief in supernatural into three categories.[4] At the most primitive level, the sea is worshiped as a living creature with an independent will. The next level is characterized by a passive attitude toward nature and a separation of nature into creator and creation. Finally an orthodox religious acceptance of God's will allows a tolerance toward guilt and retribution. From a structuralist and deconstructive perspective we can add that ritual or social convention is itself a language or metalanguage and thus in Der Schimmelreiter are part and parcel of the text and its context which are to be interpreted.

In Der Schimmelreiter, a curious combination of primitive pagan belief and Old Testament ideas of a wrathful avenging God predominates in the villager's convictions. They believe in nature's destructive power as an expression of its need to restore balance. Furthermore, the people believe Hauke to be a target of God's wrath, because he has attempted to gain immortality and because he is supposedly a blasphemer. A more tolerant orthodox religious belief is not often mentioned except for the constant references to the religious calendar: Martini, Ostern,

Lätare, Pfingsten. Saints, angels and God are a part of everyday language: "Bei Gott und Jesus"(28), "Na, Gott tröst dich, Junge"(29), "Gott bewahr uns vor Hochwasser"(33), (see also pp. 43,52,108, 114, 121). There is only one reference to the institutional practices of orthodox religion, and it is brief and indirect: "eines Sonntags nach der Kirche"(66). Other than this short remark, only the pastor and his wife are mentionned, but only in the context of the obligatory weddings and funerals. Even then the narration only describes the festivities after the ceremony.

It is Findlay's second stage of belief which transfers the villager's view of Hauke Haien from the realm of old wives' tales into religious dogma. The religious belief which is popular among the people is termed by one of its followers as "der lebendige Glaube." The sect, called the "Konventikel," a non-orthodox, loosely organized sect, with probable Anabaptist origins:

> "Das damals stark im Schwange gehende separatistische Konventikelwesen hatte auch unter den Friesen seine Blüten getrieben; heruntergekommene Handwerker oder wegen Trunkes abgesetzte Schulmeister spielten darin die Hauptrolle, und Dirnen, junge und alte Weiber, Faulenzer und einsame Menschen liefen eifrig in die heimlichen Versammlungen, in denen jeder den Priester spielen konnte."(99-100)

The word used for this religious group "Konventikel" denotes a group of fundamental dissenters which assembles secretly outside the Church. They are separatist in their attitudes towards Church and Government. Thus for example, the Anabaptists, a loose term which embraced those Protestants who did not fit either a Lutheran or Calvinist mold, saw no need for civic government for their community. Consequently they were outlawed by government authorities (and, in effect, also by themselves as they saw themselves standing outside the jurisdiction of civic law.[5]

The description of the Konventikel membership represents a pejorative judgment of this religious group. It seems to attract the lower strata of society, the losers, failures and misfits. And yet, Frau Levke, who nursed Elke during her illness, and Ann Grete, a maid in the Haien household are members of the Konventikel. So is a serving boy, "der in sie verliebte Dienstjunge," who seems to participate because of his love for Ann Grete rather than from conviction. None of these figures are despicable people. Although probably no highly respected members of local society belong to this group, those of whom we are told are certainly not layabouts or criminals. Their chief feature is their naiveté, ignorance, susceptibility to belief in the irrational, and insistence on ritual. Since such religious groups were illegal and were energetically persecuted, and often represented the illiterate sector, they had no organized theology, nor did the leaders have any training. There were virtually no restrictions on the pastoral vocation; hence, the pastors were responsible to no supervisory authority and could preach as they wished:

> "--Am dritten Abend nach diesem Tage sprach ein frommer Redner - es war ein vom Deichgrafen aus der Arbeit gejagter Pantoffelmacher - im Konventikel bei dem holländischen Schneider, da er seinen Zuhörern die Eigenschaften Gottes auseinandersetzte: 'Wer aber Gottes Allmacht widerstreitet, wer da sagt: Ich weiß, du kannst nicht, was du willst - wir kennen den Unglückseligen ja alle; er lastet gleich einem Stein auf der Gemeinde - der ist von Gott gefallen und suchet den Feind Gottes, den Freund der Sünde, zu seinem Tröster; denn nach irgendeinem Stabe muß die Hand des Menschen greifen. Ihr aber, hütet euch vor dem, der also betet; sein Gebet ist Fluch!'"(101)

Rather than describing God's omnipotence, the preacher launches into a diatribe about Hauke Haien's ungodliness. Hauke's prayer at his wife's sickbed was overheard by Frau Levke and has been interpreted by all who

have heard of it. This particular clogmaker expands the suggestion of doubt in Hauke's prayer to a total renunciation of Hauke Haien. It is a personal attack. He has lost his job through Hauke Haien and makes him a personal as well as public scapegoat. The clogmaker's indictment of Hauke Haien ends with a warning: "Ihr aber, hütet euch vor dem, der also betet." This warning and the accompanying condemnation find acceptance among the people as a foreboding which quickly spreads around the countryside.

Such religious belief appeals to the mostly illiterate lower classes in Der Schimmelreiter, because it gives them concrete explanations for their fears. With regard to Hauke Haien, the religious teaching tends to reinforce the superstitious beliefs the people already have about him and his horse. They now have a doctrinal objection to back up their intuitive uneasiness about him. The popular conclusions about Hauke Haien, previously based on old wive's tales, now carry the authoritative words of someone considered to be a man of God.

Among the people of the lowlands, conventional religious habits are rare. Other than weddings and funerals there are no indications of a regular practice of orthodox Christianity. There is no mention of Hauke's attending church services regularly or even occasionally. In fact there is no firsthand description of any Christian ceremony in the narrative, and yet a Christian tradition is apparent. Hauke Haien's father dies after pronouncing a long traditional Christian blessing.

> "Bevor er starb, rief er den Sohn an seine Lagerstatt: 'Setz dich zu mir, mein Kind.. . . . Als du, noch ein halber Junge, zu dem Deichgrafen in Dienst gingst, da lag's in deinem Kopf, das selbst einmal zu werden.. . . Aber dein Erbe war für solch ein Amt zu klein - ich habe während deiner Dienstzeit

> knapp gelebt - dacht' es zu vermehren.. . . Es ist nicht viel. . . . Mög' es zu deinem Erdenleben dienen!'" (52-53)

The blessing and the conferral of property are Tede Haien's last duty before he dies. With his last will and testament, he has fully carried out his paternal responsibility of providing for his child. He has provided well so that the family may continue with an assured livelihood. Hauke's father not only gives him an enlarged inheritance but a statement of confidence in his material future and his destiny. The father's last words are to Hauke a legacy which later becomes a firm foundation for his ambition. Tede Haien has passed on the family holdings to his son, but more importantly, he has placed his blessing on Hauke's ambitions and vision for his life-work. With this last act completed, Tede Haien is released from all concerns of life and he is ready for death. The son absorbs only part of the blessing - its content, but not its form and background: Christianity.

The other important ritual which has to do with death is the Deichgraf's funeral. The description emphasizes the detailed preparation for the burial:

> "Droben auf der Geest auf dem Begräbnisplatz um die Kirche war zu Westen eine mit Schmiedegitter umhegte Grabstätte; ein breiter blauer Grabstein stand jetzt aufgehoben gegen eine Trauerexche, auf welchem das Bild des Todes mit stark gezahnten Kiefern ausgehauen war; darunter in großen Buchstaben:
>
> Dat is de Dod, de allens fritt,
> Nimmt Kunst un Wetenschop di mit,
> De kloke Mann is nu vergahn,
> Gott gäw em selig Uperstahn. (59)

Nothing is missing from the place where Tede Volkerts is to find eternal rest. It is as though the site should aid a peaceful death. A fence protects the gravesite from intrusion or violation of any kind. An ash tree stands as a sentinel for the dead, providing shade in the summer.

An appropriate verse, not only originally engraved in the dialect but also quoted by the intervening narrators in that form, expresses a hopeful outlook on death and resurrection and reminds all of the complex tension between human life, including human reason, and The Beyond.

The Deichgraf's funeral procession provides a solemn spectacle. It furnishes a last opportunity to pay respects to the departed, which seems to be a necessary part of properly laying someone to rest:

> "Und schon kam unten aus der Marsch der Leichenzug heran, eine Menge Wagen aus allen Kirchspieldörfern; auf dem vordersten stand der schwere Sarg, die beiden blanken Rappen des deichgräflichen Stalles zogen ihn schon den sandigen Anberg zur Geest hinauf; Schweife und Mähnen der Pferde wehten in dem scharfen Frühlingswind. Der Gottesacker um die Kirche war bis an die Wälle mit Menschen angefüllt, selbst auf dem gemauerten Tore huckten Buben mit kleinen Kindern in den Armen; sie wollten alle das Begraben ansehn.(60)

The funeral procession is a large one, as befits the most important man in the village. Other villages are represented, and the churchyard is filled with curious spectators, among them children, who, unaware of the significance of death, probably view the event as some kind of parade. In a certain way the conventional ritual sponsored by the church is indeed hollow, as is the epitaph about "De kloke Mann," for the one-time Deichgraf was indeed less than intelligent, and the real religious life of the communtiy, in the sense of its conception of the supernatural, occurs elsewhere. Yet the ritual, like all other rituals in Der Schimmelreiter, still has its own meaning, and its implications for that of the narration.

Oddly enough, the person closest to the departed is at the funeral in spirit only. Elke Volkerts, the Deichgraf's daughter, is at home attending to the last minute details of the wake. She, along with the

reader, experiences the funeral ceremony indirectly:

> "Nach einer Weile entstand dort ein Gewühl, dem eine Totenstille zu folgen schien. Elke faltete die Hände; sie senkten wohl den Sarg jetzt in die Grube: 'Und zur Erde wieder sollst du werden!' Unwillkürlich, leise, als hätte sie von dort es hören können, sprach sie die Worte nach; dann füllten ihre Augen sich mit Tränen, ihre über der Brust gefalteten Hände sanken in den Schoß: 'Vater unser, der du bist im Himmel!' betete sie voll Inbrunnst. Und als das Gebet des Herrn zu Ende war, stand sie noch lange unbeweglich, sie, die jetzige Herrin dieses großen Marschhofes; und Gedanken des Todes und des Lebens begannen sich in ihr zu streiten.(60-61)

As though Elke were at the gravesite, she is intuitively aware of what is going on at the funeral ceremony. She need not be present to realize the underlying significance of the ritual which exceeds its mere external conventions. It is a ceremony which, by bringing to mind thoughts of human mortality, the sudden finality of death, and the ongoing cycle of life, makes those thoughts suddenly meaningful for the living. The burial is also ritually significant as regards the dead, as a way of consigning them to the realm of death: "Und zur Erde wieder sollst du werden!" It is the symbolic last word which finalizes death. Because **all** of this is reported indirectly in the narration, it becomes part of the commentary of the narrator, rather than simply a report of the ongoing ritual. As such it foreshadows and conditions the later description of Hauke's own death and his "burial," which are so imbued with ritualistic language and the metalanguage of ritual.

The wake is also an important part of the funeral. As the burial is significant for the dead, the wake is important for the living. Elke has everything prepared; not a detail has been forgotten:

> "Die Festtafel stand so still und einsam; der Spiegel zwischen den Fenstern war mit weißen Tüchern zugesteckt und ebenso die Messingknöpfe an dem Beilegerofen; es blinkte nichts mehr in

der Stube."

Lest any of the guests forget the solemn occasion, the conventions of proper mourning are to serve as a reminder. As wake is a social occasion and dispels some of the gravity of the preceding ceremony:

> "Dann ging sie ans Fenster, denn schon hörte sie die Wagen an der Werfte heraufrollen; einer um den andern hielt vor dem Hause, und munterer, als sie gekommen waren, sprangen jetzt die Gäste von ihren Sitzen auf den Boden. Händerreibend und plaudernd drängte sich alles in die Stube; nicht lange, so setzte man sich an die festliche Tafel, auf der die wohlbereiteten Speisen dampften, im Pesel der Oberdeichgraf mit dem Pastor; und Lärm und lautes Schwatzen lief den Tisch entlang, als ob hier nimmer der Tod seine Furchtbare Stille ausgebreitet hätte. (61-62)

The wake is an intermediary event between ceremonially putting the dead to rest, and acknowledging and facing life again as the present reality. Food is important as something which draws people together socially, but also as nourishment essential to living.

Death has been given its proper due and the lively activity the guests banishes death's presence form the place. The discussion of who will fill the office left vacant by the departed Deichgraf further affirms that life goes on. Hauke Haien is suggested, but the problem of property ownership a customary requirement, causes a dilemma:

> "'Der Mann wäre er schon,' entgegnete Jewe Manners; 'aber ihm fehlt das, was man hier Klei unter den Füßen nennt; sein Vater hatte so um fünfzehn, er mag gut zwanzig Demat haben; aber damit ist bis jetzt hier niemand Deichgraf geworden.'" (63)

Hauke Haien's proven qualifications for the office do not suffice. In order to command the respect required of the most important position in the village, the Deichgraf must have land. The provision is a conventional concession to the propertied class, so that they may grant authority to someone in such an office without violating the strictures

of social hierarchy.

Elke provides the solution by committing a violation of her mourning, a departure from convention. She announces her engagement to Hauke and her intention of ceding her property to him so that nothing will stand in the way of his succession to the office of Deichgraf. She also legitimizes the disparity between them which has been dictated by the conventions of the society:

> "'Ich werde vor der Hochzeit meinem Bräutigam die Güter übertragen. Ich habe auch meinen kleinen Stolz,' setzte sie lächelnd hinzu; 'ich will den reichsten Mann im Dorfe heiraten!'"(65)

Elke realizes that she is making a mismatch in terms of property, and she attempts to do what she can to balance the difference. She does not realize just how important her action and its later consequences are for Hauke's ego and his sense of honor. Every time social ritual is circumvented, as the property requirement is, Hauke Haien must compensate for it. It is more than a redress of social convention; for Hauke it is a matter of honor. He must prove himself, and his assertion is aimed directly at the strictures of his society, which, whether they are good or bad, have nevertheless long held it together and dictated its attitudes toward individual personality, social behavior, and the supernatural.

In a less important event, but in a similar way, Elke had intervened previously in a matter which also concerned Hauke's ego. In the annual winter competition in ice bowling, not only personal honor was involved. The village's honor was also at stake, since it was a contest between the marsh village and the highland village. Hauke takes his turn and is distracted by Ole Peters, his longtime

enemy. An antagonistic exchange ensues:

> "'Der Vogel ist dir wohl zu groß,' hörte er in diesem Augenblicke Ole Peters' Knarrstimme dicht vor seinen Ohren: 'sollen wir ihn um einen grauen Topf vertauschen?'
> Hauke wandte sich und blickte ihn mit festen Augen an: 'Ich werfe für die Marsch!' sagte er. 'Wohin gehörst du!'
> 'Ich denke, auch dahin, du wirfst doch wohl für Elke Volkerts!'
> 'Beiseit!' schrie Hauke und stellte sich wieder in Positur. Aber Ole drängte mit dem Kopf noch näher auf ihm zu. Da plötzlich, bevor noch Hauke selber etwas dagegen unternehmen konnte, packte den Zudringlichen eine Hand und riß ihn rückwärts, daß der Bursche gegen seine lachenden Kameraden taumelte. Es war keine große Hand gewesen, die das getan hatte; denn als Hauke flüchtig den Kopf wandte, sah er neben sich Elke Volkerts ihren Ärmel zurechtzupfen, und die dunkeln Brauen standen ihr wie zornig in dem heißen Antlitz."(44-45)

Ole Peters is trying to rattle Hauke's concentration for this decisive throw. Elke makes it possible for Hauke to prove himself as the best at this game, and thereby win the respect of his townspeople for having represented them so well. Later, as a result of having become Deichgraf through Elke's intervention, Hauke Haien feels an urgent necessity to prove himself through an accomplishment which will bring him honor on his own terms. We note that the language of the narrators, with its epic tones and heroic magnifications, transfers this event too into the realm of the ritual, the heroic and the legendary.

The ritual of Hauke Haien forms the basis for the theme of loneliness of the legendary hero. Hauke does not participate in much of the social rituals, especially those having a religious basis. Hauke is unconcerned with rituals of salvation, but rather with those whose purpose is honor and reputation. The ice bowling is the only instance of social ritual in which Hauke takes an active part. Throughout the narration there is a development of Hauke's own ritual which excludes the local people and even his wife.

Hauke's personal ritual consists of his visits to the sea. The many hours spent on the dike reflect a fascination with the sea and its power, and give rise to an ambition that allows nothing to interfere with its achievement. Hauke's activity involves no one else. His interest in the sea becomes an imaginary project with practical models, but he guards his knowledge as a secret. Having nothing to do with his schoolmates, he retreats often to the sea (18), especially when something bothers him, as when an insult started by Ole Peters spreads through the countryside and finally reaches him. At the sea Hauke seems to find answers to problems which torment him:

> "Kaum daß er es selber wußte, befand er sich oben auf dem Hafdeich, schon eine weite Strecke südwärts nach der Stadt zu. . . . Wäre jemand neben ihm gegangen, er hätte es schon sehen müssen, welche eindringliche Geistesarbeit hinter diesen Augen vorging.. . . Dann blickte er auf, und von dem Deiche auf dem er stand, über den Priel hinweg, zog er in Gedanken eine Linie längs dem Rande des abgetrennten Landes, nach Süden herum und ostwärts wiederum zurück über die dortige Fortsetzung des Prieles und an den Deich heran. Die Linie aber, welche er unsichtbar gezogen hatte, war ein neuer Deich, neu auch in der Konstruktion, seines Profiles, welches bis jetzt nur noch in seinem Kopf vorhanden war."(68-69)

Hauke's customary visits to the sea have become a compulsion. But unlike those who visit the sea to relax, Hauke Haien concentrates intently and his mind is actively measuring, figuring and constructing imaginary dikes and dams. His inspiration infuses Hauke with a determination to propose a new dike. Many more hours of observation, careful analysis, and measurement are required for Hauke to formulate a proposal which will find acceptance among the local people as well as the appropriate officials:

> "An Sonntagnachmittagen, oft auch nach Feierabend, saß Hauke mit einem tüchtigen Feldmesser zusammen, vertieft in Rechenaufgaben, Zeichnungen und Rissen; war er allein, dann ging es ebenso und endete oft weit nach Mitternacht.. . . Im Wintersturm

> lief er auf den Deich hinaus, mit Bleistift und Papier in der Hand, und stand und zeichnete und notierte, während ein Windstoß ihm die Mütze von Kopf riß und das lange, fahle Haar ihm um sein heißes Antlitz flog."(73)

His ambition takes precedence over all other responsibilities. His committment arose from years of planning and Hauke Haien is willing to go to any lengths to achieve a life's work which will live long after him. His project develops form childhood experiments and models to a major community effort. His motivation changes from a simple conviction that there is a better way to build dikes (12-13) to a refutation of the rumour that he is Deichgraf only because of his wife (94), to a desire for immortality (124).

Hauke's ritual visits to the sea change when the dike is under construction. Suddenly other people are involved in his undertaking. His ambition makes him a stern boss. Since the new dike is his brainchild, no carelessness escapes his attention (95). He becomes ruthless in his determination (102), and he requires the utmost effort from his workers (105). By now Hauke has realized that the workers do not understand him and oppose his plans, and it matters little to him that he antagonizes them further by his total lack of human interchange. None of the local people share his enthusiasm for the dike, with the exception of Jewe Manners. Except for orders barked at the workers, Hauke is alone again in his project.

Even after the dike is completed, Hauke Haien continues to spend time at the sea. That is natural, for he is proud of his accomplishment:

> "Noch eine Genugtuung empfing der Deichgraf eines Tages, da er in stillem, selbstbewußtem Sinnen auf dem neuen Deich entlangritt.. . . Der Schimmel ging in stolzem Galopp; vor seinen Ohren aber summte es: 'Hauke-Haien-Koog! Hauke-Haien-Koog!'

> In seinen Gedanken wuchs fast der neue Deich zu einem achten Weltwunder; in ganz Friesland war nicht seinesgleichen! Und er ließ den Schimmel tanzen; ihm war, er stünde inmitten aller Friesen; er überragte sie um Kopfeshöhe, und seine Blicke flogen scharf und mitleidig über sie hin. (109-110)

He seems to be less concerned with protecting the people than with leaving his mark behind. Hauke Haien has achieved his dream of immortality through his dike. Even he sees himself as having reached a legendary level.

Hauke's ritual cannot be understood by itself. As Northrop Frye points out, ritual is without its own meaning, since it is action not thought out. Ritual is "pre-logical, pre-verbal," and it relies on myth to give it meaning and a form of verbal communication.[6] The ritual and custom of the people are represented by certain types of myths, some of which appear in the narration. They serve as an example of beliefs which set limits and guidelines for interaction. The myth about Hauke Haien constructed by the people and by himself contains a paradox, as Findlay points out:

> Paradoxically, to destroy one myth, Hauke created another; he strove as much to become a part of local mythology as he did to destroy local superstition.[7]

Hauke wanted to do away with the necessity for any myths by building the dike. Proving that nature could be controlled, rather than feared through a dike that would last and successfully hold back the sea, Hauke would eliminate the need for irrational beliefs about nature and its power. Ironically Hauke only becomes a part of the body of irrational belief, because for the people, there is no room for rational explanations. Even after a hundred years, the dike is still intact and the same mythic beliefs still form a basis of understanding for the people.

Before examining the myths in Der Schimmelreiter some general comments are appropriate. Mtyhology has long been a recognizable element in the literary tradition. Northrop Frye acknowledges its established position in literature:

> Mythology projects itself as theology: that is, a mythopoeic poet usually accepts some myth as "true" and shapes his poetic structure accordingly.[8]

If Storm is a mythopoeic writer, then the people in Der Schimmelreiter indeed are mythopoeic. Myth is not just a folk custom, it is the defining structure of their lives and of their concept of truth.

For the people of the lowlands, the Myth of the Wandering Dead is related to their fear of the sea. They accept the inevitability of the sea's power and for this, among other reasons, consider Hauke Haien's dike plans to be futile. Throughout the years they have become used to the loss of land, livestock and life. Their greatest fear is of death at sea, which would leave their souls without a place of rest. As Findlay remarks, "the dissolution of the body in earth does not provoke the same primeval reaction of horror as dissolution in the sea."[9] The people are reminded of the importance of a land funeral by the Biblical command: "Und zur Erde sollst du werden!" Also related to the fear of limbo in death is a myth whose ritual Elke carries out at her father's funeral. She covered the mirror with a white cloth. This practice, common in the homes of the deceased, keeps, the lingering ghost from stealing someone's soul, which the mirror reflection may project.[10]

The second myth is that of Embodiment of Evil or the Scapegoat. Carsten believes the horse embodies the devil. Frazer cites numerous instances in mythology where evil is transferred to animals.[11] The

animal, or in many cases human being, becomes a scapegoat and takes the people's evils with him to his death. At the same time, the scapegoat is worshipped and, if human, may assume heroic or even tragic dimensions. In Der Schimmelreiter the people perceive the evil to be Hauke's blasphemy or even some pact with the devil. Those who attend the Konventikel, particularly, transfer their own and society's collective guilt to Hauke Haien. The evil omens in the countryside suggest that some kind of appeasement, probably of the sea, is necessary. The people seem to believe that Hauke's challenge to the sea's power requires a sacrifice of some kind - an inclination already reflected in other of their customs.

The third mythic tradition is the Living Sacrifice Myth, which has a long tradition in dike construction. Elke first introduces the superstition:

> "'Als ich ein Kind war . . . hörte ich einmal die Knechte darüber reden; sie meinten, wenn ein Damm dort halten solle, müsse was Lebigs da hineingeworfen und mit verdämmt werden; bei einem Deichbau auf der andern Seite, vor wohl hundert Jahren, sei ein Zigeunerkind verdämmet worden, das sie um schweres Geld der Mutter abgehandelt hätten; jetzt aber würde wohl keine ihr Kind verkaufen!'"(72)

If a child cannot be found, the dike workers tell Hauke, a substitute is better than nothing:

> "'Soll Euer Deich sich halten, so muß was Lebiges hinein. . . . Das haben unsere Großväter schon gewußt, die sich mit Euch im Christentum wohl messen durften! Ein Kind ist besser noch; wenn das nicht da ist, tut's auch wohl ein Hund!'"(107)

There is an ironic taunt in the comparison of the Christian faith of the fathers and Hauke's Christianity. Whatever doubts they have about Hauke's Christian beliefs, the dike workers see no conflict between the superstition of the living sacrifice and Christianity. The idea behind such an action is dualistic. Burial of a living rather than a

dead being in the dike infuses life into an inanimate object and empowers it to withstand the sea's energy. In another sense, such a sacrifice is an appeasement of the sea which is intended to insure the dike's protective function.

We can see that in Der Schimmelreiter the three myths of sacrifice, embodiment of evil, and wandering dead are part of a collective myth in the beliefs of the local people, though distinct from one another within the body of mythology. The origins of the collective myth are unclear. The myths are a mixture of Christian, pagan and nordic-pagan elements: the Promethean (and Socratic), the Christ/parallel (suffering and sacrifice), the heroic (Ritter), and the ghost-like. Each element is necessary to the myth which Storm is creating, and he introduces them without producing the effect of jarring cultural backgrounds. Storm again surrounds the irrational with hazy parameters so that we cannot separate one myth from another or definitively limit the boundaries of rational and irrational.

Hauke Haien will have nothing to do with the primitive beliefs of his countrymen, just as he opposes anything that reflects an irrational belief. Hauke's dike is completed successfully without mishap or the use of ritual. Upon the dike's completion, Hauke Haien begins to view himself in a mythic mode; he sees himself as standing head and shoulders above everyone else. His technical achievement is his alone and it is due to his intellectual powers. His daughter's childish faith in his ability to do everything (116-117), is simply an affirmation of what Hauke himself believes; man's rational powers can overcome all irrational obstacles. He has carried out a Promethean role, that of the hero who spites the gods and defies nature.

Hauke becomes, in anthropological terms, a culture hero, whose traits become legendary. Thus the schoolmaster compares Hauke Haien to Socrates and Jesus Christ. We note that he refers to their sacrifice as a prominent element of their legendary character: "dem Sokrates gaben sie ein Gift zu trinken, und unsern Herrn Christus schlugen sie an das Kreuz!"(145) The culture hero is quasi-historical, and although he dies he becomes timeless and is recurrently reborn and dies again. Another typical recurrent trait of the culture hero is his separation form the people, a loneliness which is regarded either as innate and natural, or else tragic and sacrificial. As Frye describes it,

> Tragic heroes are wrapped in the mystery of their communion with that something beyond which we can see only through them, and which is the source of their strength and their fate alike.[12]

Also true of Hauke Haien as a legendary hero is his admonitory function. The Aristotelian flaw is the wrong which he commits; he forgets his humanity, and his ambition disturbs the balance of nature. The restoration of balance may be achieved by a sacrifice, which may occur through a number of means:

> The agent or instrument of nemesis may be human vengeance, ghostly vengeance, divine vengeance, divine justice, accident, fate or the logic of events, but the essential thing is that nemesis happens.[13]

Hauke's realization that he has failed leads him to accept nature's retribution.

> "Er allein hatte die Schwäche des alten Deiches erkannt; er hätte trotz alldem das neue Werk betreiben müssen: 'Herr Gott, ja ich bekenn es,' rief er plötzlich laut in den Sturm hinaus, 'ich habe meines Amtes schlecht gewartet!'"(140-141)

Ironically, his moment of weakness emrged when for the first time

he requested the advice of others, instead of issuing his own orders. Seeing his wife and child taken by the flood, Hauke acknowledges the end in sight for himself and explicitly assumes a sacrificial role:

> "'Das Ende!' sprach er leise vor sich hin; dann ritt er in den Abgrund, wo unter ihm die Wasser, unheimlich rauschend, sein Heimatsdorf zu überfluten begannen; noch immer sah er das Licht von seinem Hause schimmern; es war ihm wie entseelt. Er richtete sich hoch auf und stieß dem Schimmel die Sporen in die Weichen; das Tier bäumte sich, es hätte sich fast überschlagen; aber die Kraft des Mannes drückte es herunter. 'Vorwärts!' rief er noch einmal, wie er es so oft zum festen Ritt gerufen hatte: 'Herr Gott, nimm mich; verschon die andern!'"(143)

Suddenly, unforeseen consequences appear to him. The safety of his village, which the new dike was to guarantee, is now threatened by the growing flood. The loss of wife and child leave his home without life. In the chaos around him, Hauke begins to see events in less than purely rational terms. Whether he really can stem the tide by riding into the flood does not matter to him. He consciously rides to his death as a sacrifice, as the only thing he can do. In so doing Hauke Haien mythifies himself, although he is himself unaware of the mythic implications of his actions. He certainly would not view his ambition or even his sacrificial end as a mythic tendency. Indeed he is opposed to mythic belief, as something which allows for an irrational world view, even an irrational world, which for him is totally unacceptable.

As I mentioned previously, ritual and myth are a part of the way in which the villagers view nature. One either tries to explain the supernatural elements realistically, as does Hauke Haien, or one simply accepts the inexplicable aspects of nature, as Iven Johns responds to the Schimmel; or else, finally, one believes the irrational

explanations. Even among his contemporaries, Hauke Haien is a mythic figure, who is explained in the last of these ways: "Einen Augenblick schwieg alles, denn aus dem hageren Gesicht des Deichgrafen sprühte der Zorn, und sie hatten abergläubische Furcht vor ihm."(106-107) For the people Hauke Haien becomes the living sacrifice, which makes the dike indestructible. At the same time the imbalance in nature has climaxed and been resolved. Because Hauke Haien has met his death in the sea, he becomes a wandering dead man, a ghost who may reappear.

Because of the results of Hauke's death, namely the dike's successful resistance of the sea, the return to "normal" local custom, Hauke Haien's mythification is a foregone conclusion. Even at the 1756 level of the legend Hauke becomes a mythic figure, because his achievement ranks him among superhuman if not god-like heroes, and his death has an atoning function. Part of the purpose of the myth is to serve as a continuing warning. The warning remains throughout the tradition of the Schimmelreiter legend.

It would seem appropriate that the myth of the dike and of its builder would remain in the local tradition, especially at times when the security of the Hauke-Haien dike is endangered. The legend is an important part of the local folk history, retold on stormy nights as a reminder of the sacrifice which gives the dike its power to withstand nature. The implicit warning is the same as in 1756: a challenge to nature's power is presumptious, and the price is one's life. Part of the warning is the threat of limbo in a death at sea. The warning, as well as the reminder of sacrifice, repeats itself in the recurring Schimmelreiter appearances. Yet the apparition also warns the people to make sure that the dike is strong. Because it is so important a

part of the local culture, the people maintain the myth, especially that which allows for recurring phantoms. There is certainly a desire to experience the irrational: the mere suggestion of the Schimmelreiter results in two more sightings. Again Storm introduces an ambiguity; the first appearance of the Schimmelrieter has no logical basis. It is hard to tell if it was "real" or imagined. We do not know why the 1880 reader told the story. Storm leaves us with the 1820 story as the legend's inconclusive ending. We can only sssume that the 1880 reader is fascinated by the legend itself and the paradoxical elements which form the myth. Storm seems to view the irrational as an explanation for that which continues to raise questions about life. The mixture of rational and irrational helps to epxlain the chaos in the world order.

CHAPTER IV

HAUKE HAIEN AND SOCIETY

Hauke Haien's defiant position in the legend not only towards nature but also society obviates the need for a social interpretation of the legend, both in regard to a fictive society and the reader's real society.

The narration focuses on Hauke Haien, the figure who is central to the Schimmelreiter legend. What the narration reveals and a "deconstructive" interpretation, either formal or informal, uncovers is a man with whom we can empathize. He was a very human man, for whom life was not easy. He fought social conventions to attain the position which he felt was his by right. He opposed the superstitions of his people and the forces of nature to build a dike which would distinguish him in history. While he is a man with a driving ambition and a long-range vision, he also lacks a broader perspective. Since Hauke Haien's work was a struggle with the people and with nature a discussion of Hauke Haien's relationship to both society and nature illuminates some facts which must be conidered before we can form conclusions about Hauke Haien as a legendary figure.

Hauke Haien is a leader of his people. He has attained the highest position in the village, without any of the implicit or explixit qualifications for a position of respected leadership. As a boy Hauke was a loner, spending time by himself on the dike rather than with schoolmates. He shunned people and he set himself apart from the rest

of society as a non-conformist when he killed Trin' Jans' cat. If we can accept Ellis' view, this act is later to have serious consequences for Hauke.[1] His strength is his ability with figures, Rechnen. This talent brings Hauke an opportunity to do the work which he believes he has a right to do. As he helps the Deichgraf not only with the figures but with the actual duties of overseeing the proper maintenance of the dikes, dams and sluices, Hauke slowly builds a mixed reputation among the people. Though he has a flair for doing the job right, Hauke lacks the leadership qualities which would ingratiate him with the people, who notice a difference in the way affairs are being conducted. Through Ole Peter's vindictive "tattling," word soon spreads that it is Hauke who is responsible for the change in dike administration.(34-35) Hauke, who has not cultivated many social contacts, has a small basis of support in comparison to the dominant social leadership which Ole Peters often uses against Hauke Haien.

Though Ole Peters often holds sway in social situations, he cannot overcome the respect the people have for the very position of Deichgraf, as well as for the man who does the actual work of the office. Hauke's informal reputation as the real Deichgraf is decisive for his entry into the ice-bowling contest. The question of land ownership is problematic; though his father owns land, it is perhaps not enough. He is still young and is merely a stable-hand. Someone finally brings to the attention of those assembled that Hauke Haien is the Deichgraf, practically speaking. All agree that Hauke is that man and cannot be left out of the ice-bowling competition.

Hauke's performance in the ice-bowling leaves no doubt that the right man was picked. Elke's intervention in a verbal fray between Ole

Peters and Hauke challenges Hauke to prove himself worthy of her action. A spiritual bond exists between them. They have much in common, and though they waste few words on one another, there is an understanding between them. At the dance following the contest Hauke and Elke do not dance with one another. Hauke has a sense for the meaning of the custom. He realizes, when he sees Ole Peters dancing with Vollina Herders, that there is a wedding in the offing. Hauke values the privacy of his feelings for Elke and is not willing to make them subject to public gossip. Hauke's privacy is apparent in the following scene, when Hauke buys a ring, obviously for Elke.(49) He is unwilling to disclose to the goldsmith for whom he is buying a ring, and asks that he measure for a small fit. The goldsmith, puzzled, suggests that Hauke try a ladies' ring, which causes Hauke to blush immediately. Everything of great importance to Hauke, whether his ambition for the office of Deichgraf or his feelings for Elke, he guards as a secret from the world.

If Hauke is capable of love he is also capable of great hate. There is continual tension between Hauke and Ole Peters. Hauke directs his negative feelings toward Ole Peters as a representative of the people, against whom he also harbors some strong sentiments:

> "Eine Reihe von Gesichtern ging vor seinem innern Blick vorüber und sie sahen ihn alle mit bösen Augen an; da faßte ihn ein Groll gegen diese Menschen: er streckte die Arme aus, als griffe er nach ihnen, denn sie wollten ihn vom Amte drängen, zu dem von allen nur er berufen war. - Und die Gedanken ließen ihn nicht: sie waren immer wieder da, und so wuchsen in seinem jungen Herzen neben der Ehrenhaftigkeit udn Liebe auch die Ehrsuch Ehrsucht und der Haß. Aber diese beiden verschloß er tief in seinem Innern; selbst Elke ahnte nichts davon.(57)

Again, Hauke Haien keeps his deepest feelings to himself. His confiction that he has some kind of special right to the office of Deichgraf borders on megalomania, according to Findlay.[2] His growing antagonism towar the people arises form a feeling of insecurity and an intolerance toward those whom Hauke considers inferior. Throughout the dike project, Hauke isolates himself futher by his ruthless behavior toward his workers.(102) Though Elke and his child become a refuge for him, his daughter's mental handicap becomes an ingredient of guilt in Hauke and Elke's marriage.(118)

Hauke's relationships are characterized by a lack of communication. He maintains minimal contacts with those with whom he works, from childhood associations with schoolmates and fellow workers on the dike, to his cooperation with the dike council and his supervision of the dike workers. Though he has made a truce with Trin' Jans regarding his violent slaying of her cat, Hauke's relationship to Trin' is characterized by reprimands and a lack of understanding and acceptance. His child is retarded, and easily influeced by the stories she hears from others. She is fearful of the unkown. While Hauke shows patience with her fascination for superstition, he scorns the same attitude in the people. His relationship to Elke is one of mutual understanding. They provide moral support for each other, but even in this most important human exchange, Hauke and Elke often uphold each other with looks and gestures rather than with words. Scant verbal exchange characterizes Hauke' manner of interacting with people. An inability to integrate socially is a factor in making Hauke the lonely figure that he is. Ellis' commentary describes Hauke's behavior in terms of his personality; Hauke does not have a well-rounded character.[3] It matches his physical description: "hager." Hauke does not understand the people he

leads. He does not perceive social interaction as one of his duties and would much prefer administering his duties without having to consult with the dike council.

Hauke's isolation from society limits his perception of causal relationships; he is surprised by the workers' animosity. Even though Hauke pays close attention to matters related to the dike, observations are aimed at only a specific objective which leads Hauke to misunderstand nature, just as he misunderstands society. Many textual references suggest Hauke's single-mindendness: "was er allein hier sah"(12); "seine Augen unabläßig nach der Seeseite gerichtet"(18); "und Hauke setzte alles daran, um jetzt den Schluß zu machen"(104). Some of his physical actions reveal his attitude toward nature. He shouts at the sea (13-14) and kills sandpipers (18). Hauke shows a further lack of understanding when he kills Trin' Jans' cat. He has conditioned the cat to expect some of the birds which he has killed. The cat acts out of habit, and Hauke simply reacts unthinkingly, killing the cat. Ellis believes that this action results in a disturbance of the ecology; mice begin to appear (32), and they are a possible cause for the damage in the dike (123,127). Even Hauke's one strength, his math ability is seen as a weakness:

> There is something insufficient about a concept, if it is to sum up the intelligence of a human being. It is a bloodless and abstract kind of intelligence, and is not adequate for dealings with people or nature. Hauke can calculate how much earth a dyke needs in order for it to contain a given amount of water; but the calculation fails to take the mice into account! This significantly small natural species is allowed to show the inadequacy of Hauke's "rechnen," its over-simplicity and inability to take into account issues other than mechanical ones.[4]

Of course the figure of Hauke Haien can be interpreted more positively, or at least differently. We cannot ignore the argument that

Hauke stands for reason, progress, and a better life. Hauke Haien's achievement cannot be denied. The critics disagree about what kind of hero Storm presents to us. Some argue that he is an example of the modern rational man, who can achieve great things. Others, such as Jost Hermand, view Hauke Haien as a criticism of social and political conditions in late nineteenth century Germany, and perceive the legend's function primarily as a warning. Hermand interprets Der Schimmelreiter as social commentary on Storm's time, more specifically the Gründerzeit, the 1870s and 1880s. The work in its totality, according to Hermand reflects the period of German unification and the emphasis on individual greatness as exemplified by Bismarck. Similarly, Hauke Haien achieves greatness, but his greatness is not based on a combination of virtues.[5] Hermand claims that Storm presents Hauke Haien as a warning about Bismarck himself and for those who would aspire to the same greatness:

> In diesem Werk alles Behagliche und Humane fehlt, das Storm sonst so zu preisen versteht. Denn schließlich besteht Haukes einzige "Leistung" in einem großen, aber doch rücksichtslos durchgeführten Gewaltmanöver, das allzu deutlich an die Parole von "Blut und Eisen" erinnert. Und damit wird man unwillkürlich an Storms Verhältnis zu Bismarck erinnert, den er zeit seines Lebens als Mensch und Gründer abgelehnt hat.[6]

According to Hermand, Storm exposes Bismarck through Hauke Haien as a false hero who cares little about the people: "Immer trägt er irgendein Groll mit sich herum."[7] Hermand refers to Hauke Haien, but reminds us of Bismarck's well-known habit of staying awake at night hating people. Storm is shattering Germany's ideal in Der Schimmelreiter, at least as the novelle is interpreted by Jost Hermand. Yet an overall perception of Hauke Haien, as I have argued, must be based on an examination of attitudes at the various narrative levels, and must take a variety of critical views into account.

CHAPTER V

RECEPTORS: TRANSMITTERS, LISTENERS AND READERS

Throughout Der Schimmelreiter ambiguities, ironies, and many subjective opinions surround the Hauke Haien figure. There probably will never be a final, absolutely valid judgment about this character. But whatever the conclusions we may derive, they should be solidly based on an examination of attitudes toward Hauke Haien within and outside the work. Such an interpretation must include a study of transmitted narrative attitudes and a survey of the legend's reception by both contemporary and later hearers and readers.

The fictive 1756 perceptors' opinion of Hauke Haien is based on direct observation of Hauke's actions and his behavior toward society. This view is unaffected by the legend with its suppositions of motivation, and its exposition - hypothetical of course - of private thoughts and feelings of Hauke Haien, for such elements are later accretions to the oral and written legend. In order to get to the people's view of Hauke Haien, as the best "real" view, we could attempt to strip away all feelings and reflections which have been attributed to Hauke by the legend. Yet even the 1756 understanding of Hauke Haien is clouded by the general supernaturalism of his society and by the superstitions about him which have grown within his lifetime. Ole Peters represents one example of the people's more pragmatic attitude toward Hauke Haien. They regard him as an outsider; he rejects their traditions and beliefs, and imposes strict regulations on their livelihood.

Whether he deserves the respect or not, he has achieved a successful position and increased his wealth. Carsten represents the superstitious perspective. Hauke embodies evil for those in the Konventikel and for others who have strong beliefs in the supernatural. Trin' Jans' observation that God is punishing Hauke through his daughter's mental retardation is only a small part of a general implicit conviction that greater tragedy awaits Hauke.

Yet among the people are those whom Hauke's industry and ambition impress. Jewe Manners leads this group. Because of their confidence in Hauke Haien, he was admitted to the ice bowling contest. Later, they recognize his capabilities for dike maintenance, and the community elders appoint Hauke Haien Deichgraf. That this party is in the minority is apparent in a major dike construction scene, in which Jewe Manners acts as mediator between the angry workers and the stubborn Deichgraf.(106-107). Manners tries to bring about some kind of understanding between the opposing factions.

The schoolmaster plays a similar mediating role in two senses. Not only does he mediate the narration; with the fiction he also attempts to effect some kind of reconciliation between a superstitious understanding of Hauke and his own calm reasoned interpretation. The schoolmaster presents Hauke with all his flaws, and yet he compares the hero with Socrates and Christ, as a figure misunderstood and mistreated by his contemporaries. The schoolmaster even calls Hauke Haien, "einen tüchtigen Kerl. . . uns um Kopfeslänge überwachsen."(145) This opinion is expressed at the end of the narration and thus carries particular weight for all who subsequently receive the narration. Despite any weaknesses which he has reported, the schoolmaster stresses Hauke's

achievement; the dike, still standing after one hundred years, represents a triumph of reason over superstition. The dike is proof that human skill can tame nature, and that progress can bring a better life, as Ellis interprets the schoolmaster's closing speech.[1]

The reference to Antje Vollmers' more popular version of the legend indicates that the villagers think differently. The schoolmaster's concluding remarks carry the accusation that the people's attitude is vindictive:

> "Der Dank, den einstmals Jewe Manners bei den Enkeln seinem Erbauer versprochen hatte, ist, wie Sie gesehen haben, ausgeblieben; denn so ist es, Herr: dem Sokrates gaben sie ein Gift zu trinken, und unsern Herrn Christus schlugen sie an das Kreuz! Das geht in den letzten Zeiten nicht mehr so leicht; aber - einen Gewaltsmenschen oder einen bösen stiernackigen Pfaffen zum Heiligen, oder einen tüchtigen Kerl, nur weil er uns um Kopfeslänge überwachsen war, zum Spuk und Nachtgespenst zu machen - das geht noch alle Tage."(145)

The shoolmaster seems to be the only person in the community who fully appreciates Hauke Haien's accomplishment, even though he does not fully grasp the heroic and tragic nature of Hauke Haien's character. He suggests that without the limits imposed by the law, violence might have been committed against Hauke Haien. Yet he considers the fate of the hero analagous to sacrilege; that is, relegating Hauke Haien's story to legend is as blasphemous as sanctifying a criminal. The schoolmaster finds the transformation of a local hero into a ghost an insensitive affront.

While the 1820 villagers are not impressed by the human achievements which the dike represents, they are fearfully affected by the mere suggestion of the spector. Their apprehensive fascination for the phantom, based on a respect for the unknown, is just like Hauke's dike workers' fear and awe of the irrational traits which they attribute to

Hauke and his horse. Among the villagers the tradition of superstitious belief has remained stronger than a rational world view. Even the Deichgraf, whose position commands the most respect in the village, prefers Antje Vollmers' version of the legend, and apparently he believes in the recurring phantom. He reminds the article writer that however rational the schoolmaster's version might have been, what the writer has seen with his own eyes cannot be refuted.

The article writer apparently has no problems assessing the events of the evening. For him, the conflict between rational and irrational in his experience is nothing that a good night's sleep cannot solve. The next morning the storm is over. What he saw on the dike does not make any logical sense, since he had known nothing of the legned and the local superstitions. He had no rational basis to explain his experience. Only nature's destruction remains as proof of the previous evening's chaotic occurrences. The dike reminds the article writer of the legend, which he has heard and encountered, but he does not commit himself to a single definitive interpretation of the facts. Yet he deems the legend worthy of a written account. If we conclude that the article writer simply wrote a ghost story, in which his inclusion only serves a technical function, his interpretation perhaps is less important.

We might compare the article writer's ability to write ghost stories with Storm's accomplishment. Storm wrote many ghost stories with a definite artistic intention. McCormick quotes Fontane's remarks in the Deutsche Rundschau of 1896:

> "Denselben Abend erzählte er Storm auch Spukgeschichten, was er ganz vorzüglich verstand, weil es immer klang, als würde das, was er vortrug, aus der Ferne von einer leisen

> Violine begleitet. Die Geschichten an und für sich waren meist unbedeutend und unfertig, und wenn wir ihm das sagten, so wurde sein Gesicht nur noch spitzer, und mit schlauem Lächeln erwiderte er: Ja, das ist das Wahre; daran können Sie die Echtheit erkennen; solche Geschichte muß immer ganz wenig sein und unbefriedigt lassen; aus dem Unbefriedigten ergibt sich zuletzt die höchste künstlerische Befriedigung.[2]

The incompleteness to which Storm refers is apparent in Der Schimmelreiter. He presents us with a narration whose main character can be interpreted in a variety of ways, a narrator - the schoolmaster - whose s ry is a mixture of two potentially conflicting versions, and a closing frame narrator - article writer - who offers no conclusions.

I would suggest, not surprisingly, that Storm assumes the external narrator's role, i.e. that of the article reader, since he does not refer back to the reader at the end of the novella. After constructing a multiple framework of narrator, receptor-narrator, reader-narrator, Storm failed to "close" the outer frame. Storm has at the end also left out a fictive reader. The myth which he presents and interprets at various levels is complex in its transmission and interpretation. It is a myth for all times which needs to be reinterpreted by Storm's contemporary readers and subsequent receptors.

An excerpt from a letter from Storm to Erich Schmidt suggests that the conflict of rational and irrational in the schoolmaster's narration ranked in importance only beneath the human conflict between Hauke and the people:

> Ich verlange für den Dichter das Recht, wenn er es kann, auch eine vergangene ja auch eine fremde Welt uns heraufzubeschwören; es kommt Alles immer und immer nur darauf an, daß er uns in dieser einen poetisch angeschauten ewig menschlichen Inhalt zu geben vermag; in welcher Form ihm diesen lebendig geworden und zum Ausdruck gekommen, darauf kommt für Werth und Dauer nichts an, so lange Schauplatz und Umgebung bescheiden bleiben und sich nicht als Hauptsache vordrängen. (May 22, 1883) [3]

Storm's language reiterates the irrational ingredient. He views himself as a magician or medium who conjures up unheard-of events. The context of the story may include fantastic elements, as long as the human factor takes precedence. In Der Schimmelreiter Storm presents the problem of human achievement and its limitations. For him it is a timeless question:

> Immer und unter allen Umständen wird die Poesie in jedem Jahrhundert, dem sich ihr Stoff am sichersten anpaßt, ihr Zelt aufschlagen können: nur soll der Stoff selbst nicht auf vorübergehenden Zuständen beruhen, sondern auf rein menschlichen Conflicten, die wir ewig nennen.(Dec.12,1885)[4]

Storm deals with general human problems, rather than offering a commentary on specific issues of his time. To attribute as specific a political parallel to a work as Jost Hermand's tendency, is to deny other intentions which Storm may have had and also the possibility of a broader, more general interpretation. The criticism of the hero, which Hermand supports, is appropriate to the times in which Storm wrote.[5] Storm's warning about the hero's inevitable fall certainly reflects an accurate assessment of the political climate. Events leading to Bismarck's fall from power two years after publication of Der Schimmelreiter were already evident in 1888. Ceratinly the reader may have drawn similar conclusions. Especially those who knew something about Storm's dislike of Bismarck might well have been inclined to seek a parallel between the novella's hero and the near-legendary political hero of unified Germany.

The Gründerzeit as a whole is characterized by the magnification of old heroes, newly produced legends of new heroes and the procurement of manufactured pedigrees for the nouveau riche. Especially at this time, upward social mobility was a widespread ambition.

I wonder whether Storm's contemporary readers were in a position to grasp his critique. Storm had no reputation for political commentary in his literary creations. Readers familiar with his earlier works were not likely to draw the same kind of conclusion a Jost Hermand does about the rather provincial northern writer of sea tales and ghost stories. It would be more reasonable to conclude that Storm intended a much more general presentation of the tragic hero's action and motives. The consequences remind modern man that his humanness is the final limit to his ambition and achievement. We may argue with Walter Silz, who assesses Hauke Haien as "a formidable champion who confronts the present and the future with clear eye...the creative individual, the man with a dream, and a mission."[6] If we view Hauke in such a positive light, then his end is certainly a tragedy. But since death is the Fate of all men, and there is truth to the saying that a prophet is without honor in his own homeland, even an interpretation of Hauke Haien as an ideal man must include the warning to those who would also aspire to the same heights, implied in Martini's description fo Hauke Haien's fate:

> Der Schimmelreiter, der im Leben von der Dauer seines Namens träumte, nach seinem Tod als ein ruheloses Gespenst an seinen Deich gebannt ist, unerlöst an sein Schicksal gefesselt, so daß er zugleich in seinem Werk als Held, Retter und Schrecken des Volkes nachlebt.[7]

The other "contemporary critical" view of Hauke Haien typifies twentieth century pessimism. Too often today's reader has seen the inevitable fate of his heroes conclude in a violent, senseless death, or in a disgracing exposé of selfish ulterior motives. We are either disillusioned by our heroes or fear for them, as though we realize that such elevation of human beings is inappropriate.

Storm's emphasis on balance strongly implies a criticism of the hero Hauke Haien and the general human temptation of striving for immortality. Hauke Haien's loneliness, ruthlessness and driving ambition will not be ignored by the twentieth century reader. Despite an emphasis on the positive aspects of technological achievement, Der Schimmelreiter focuses on the man behind the achievement. In doing so it raises questions about people and their world which still concern today's reader. Storm poses the human problems at each narrative level, suggesting that they exist both within the structural boundaries of a multi-layered narration and, by the extension that open-ended narrative pattern suggests, in our own discourse.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Throughout my study I have argued that ambiguity is essential to the meaning of Der Schimmelreiter. The ideas developed in chapters II, III, and IV suggest how it is expressed both in narrative structure and in objective content. Here I shall review those ideas and then complete my analysis with a more precise discussion of the nature and function of language in Der Schimmelreiter.

Storm leaves the reader with an open, unfinished frame, which, I have argued, encourages the reader to add his or her own judgment to that of the schoolmaster, the Deichgraf, and the non-committal article writer. Storm has not offered any easy answers. The contradictions with which he has filled Der Schimmelreiter obscures any definitive view which could be interpreted as Storm's meaning.

Similarly, the temporal discrepancies come to mind every time a season, month or religious holiday appears as a reference point. Those apparently precise indicators of time are vague markers which correspond to events only for the narrator in his narration. The narration itself is a mixture of conflicting viewpoints; the first half reflects the schoolmaster's bias and the second half represents the villager's beliefs. Throughout the narrative structure, in the elements of the legend and reflected in the language, the conflict of rational and irrational alternately elicits the reader's acceptance and doubt, especially of supernatural appearences. The inclusion of supernatural elements constructs the foundation for the appearance of

the Schimmelreiter phantom: the ironic mythification of the myth-defying hero. The focal point of so much paradox, Hauke Haien, embodies the textual contradictions, about which we are offered no conclusions. Critics offer varying judgments, of whose worth they seem convinced. Other equally convincing arguments are ignored or refuted but rarely incorporated.

The same pattern of ambiguities appears when one examines Hauke's relationship to society. His relationship with his own society is ambivalent, and therefore, any interpretation of the figure's meaning for Storm's society (or our own) must consider the alternate (but not contradictory) implications of the legend.

But Der Schimmelreiter is literary text, and therefore exists through its words, both those of the narrator and of fictive characters. We cannot analyse everything. Here is an exemplary passage to show the stylistic features of ambiguity:

> "Der schmale Weg war grundlos, denn die Tage vorher war unermeßlicher Regen gefallen; aber der nasse saugende Klei schien gleichwohl die Hufen des Tieres nicht zu halten, es war, als hätte es festen Sommerboden unter sich. Wie eine wilde Jagd trieben die Wolken am Himmel; unten lag die weite Marsch wie eine unerkennbare, von unruhigen Schatten erfüllte Wüste; von dem Wasser hinter dem Deiche, immer ungeheurer, kam ein dumpfes Tosen, als müsse es alles andere verschlingen. 'Vorwärts, Schimmel!' rief Hauke; 'wir reiten unseren schlimmsten Ritt!'
> Da klang es wie ein Todesschrei unter den Hufen seines Rosses. . . . . und schon hob der Schimmel zu neuem Rennen seine Hufen; da setzte der Sturm plötzlich aus, eine Totenstille trat an seine Stelle; nur eine Sekunde lang, dann kam er mit erneuter Wut zurück."(136)

The vocabulary and diction of this section may be categorized into five groups. The first category is auditory vocabulary. Words such as "dumpfes Tosen," "Todesschrei," and "Totenstille," all carry connotations of a dreadful outcome. "Dumpfes Tosen" suggests that nature has unleashed its chaotic, furious, sub-human but animate power. The

"Todesschrei" foreshadows Hauke's end, as does the unsettling sudden silence of "Totenstille."

The scene is indeed dominated by sounds. The one visual element, the reference to the obscuring darkness of the night is the remark that the storm has transformed everything into "eine unerkennbare . . . Wüste." The verb "scheinen" and the subjunctive forms, "als hätte," "als müsse," add an unreal tone to a narration otherwise oriented to palpable sensations. Numerous temporal expressions transform the past action into present experience: "immer ungeheurer, kam," effects a continued intensification of the sound, "da klang es," "da setzte der Sturm plötzlich aus," bring action suddenly into the present by the use of "da." Although the verbs which these adverbs modify are in the past tense, the modifiers animate the retold action with new life.

The last language category is more than a reflection of emotions in nature. The technique of "solemn sympathy" coined by Shakespeare, personifies nature, gives it life, and involves it in the event: "der nasse saugende Klei," Wie eine Jahd trieben die Wolken am Himmel," "von unruhigen Schatten erfüllte Wüste," "kam er mit erneuter Wut." Verbal adjectives such as "saugend, erfüllte, erneuter" add action to the description. Words which denote emotion, like "unruhig, Wut" attach feeling to nature. By drawing nature actively into the narration, Storm places Hauke Haien on a mythic plane. According to Frye, "the use of 'solemn sympathy' in a piece of more realistic fiction indicates that the author is trying to give his hero some of the overtones of the mythical mode.[1] Storm creates the mythical atmosphere very skillfully, not only through the use of language, which affects the reader at a less apparent level of narration. Mythic elements in the nature descriptions, as a part of folk custom and belief, and in the

nature descriptions, as a part of folk custom and belief, and in the character of Hauke Haien are further reinforced in the reader's perception because they are transmitted to the reader by Storm's mythic language.

The problem of Der Schimmelreiter may be summed up in an assessment of Storm's success with this work. He has created a literary work of art: a richly textured text whose context must be considered. Precisely because of its multiplicity of narrative levels and its combination of realism and myth, the text expresses a range of meanings which should be viewed not as contradictory, but rather complementary facets of the evolution, the transmission and reception of a time-bound, yet timeless and ultimately timely legend.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

[1]Hans Robert Jauß, Literaturgeschichte als Provokation (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970).

[2]E. Allen Mc Cormick, Theodor Storm's Novellen: Essays on literary technique (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964).

[3]Franz Stuckert, Theodor Storm, der Dichter in seinem Werk (Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1966).

[4]Walter Silz, Realism and reality: Studies in the German novelle of poetic realism (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina press, 1954).

[5]Johannes Klein, Geschichte der deutschen Novelle von Goethe bis zur Gegenwart (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1956).

[6]Silz, Realism and Reality, p. 10.

[7]Josef Kunz, ed., Novelle, vol. XV of Wege der Forschung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), pp. 381-382.

[8]Klein, p. 268.

[9]Silz, Realism and Reality, p. 124.

[10]Lee Jennings, "'Shadows from the void' in Theodor Storm's Novellen," Germanic Review, 37, No. 3, p. 189.

[11]Ian Findlay, "Myth and Redemption in Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter," Papers on Languages and Literature, 11, No. 4, pp. 397-403.

[12]John Ellis, "Narration in Storm's Der Schimmelreiter," Germanic Review, 44, No. 1, p. 21.

[13]Jost Hermand, Von Mainz nach Weimar (1793 - 1919): Studien zur deutschen Literatur (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1969), pp. 250-267.

[14]Josué Harrari, ed., Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979) p. 30.

[15]Jacques Derrida, Of Grammatology, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 1972), pp. 19, 20.

[16]Harrari, p. 37.

[17]Harrari, p. 42.

[18]Harrari, p. 147.

[19]Harrari, p. 74.

[20]Harrari, p. 76.

[21]Harrari, p. 145.

[22]Harrari, p. 80.

[23]Harrari, p. 78-79.

[24]Harrari, p. 151.

[25]Harrari, p. 159.

[26]Harrari, p. 147.

[27]Eugenio Donato, and Richard Macksey, eds., The Sturcturalist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 1972), p. 271.

[28]Donato, p. 249.

[29]Donato, p. 249.

[30]Donato, pp. 260-261.

[31]Stuckert, p. 91.

[32]Fritz Martini, Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964), p. 631.

[33]Martini, pp. 631-633.

CHAPTER II

[1]Ellis, "Narration," p. 21.

[2]Hermand, p. 254.

[3]Stuckert, p. 109.

[4]Ellis, "Narration," p. 30.

[5]Ellis, "Narration," p. 22.

[6]Hermand, p. 257.

[7]Ellis, "Narration," p. 25.

[8]Ellis, Narration, p. 161.

CHAPTER III

[1]Silz, Realism and Reality, p. 124.

[2]Stuckert, p. 108.

[3]Walter Silz, "Theodor Storm's Schimmelreiter," PMLA, 61, p. 774.

[4]Findlay, p. 400.

[5]Stephen Ozment, The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth-Century Germany and Switzerland (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), p. 73.

[6]Frye, p. 106.

[7]Findlay, p. 399.

[8]Frye, p. 64.

[9]Findlay, p. 400.

[10]James George Frazer, The Golden Bough (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 223.

[11]Frazer, p. 626.

[12]Frye, p. 208.

[13]Frye, p. 209.

CHAPTER IV

[1]Ellis, "Narration," p. 28.

[2]Findlay, p. 401.

[3]Ellis, "Narration," p. 29.

[4]Ellis, "Narration," p. 28.

[5]Hermand, p. 252.

[6]Hermand, p. 267.

[7]Hermand, p. 256.

CHAPTER V

[1]Ellis, "Narration," p. 30.

[2]McCormick, p. 38.

[3]Karl Ernst Laage, ed., Theodor Storm-Erich Schmidt: Briefwechsel, Kritische Ausgabe, 2 Vols. (Berlin: E. Schmidt Verlag, 1972), p. 81.

[4]Laage, p. 204.

[5]Hermand, p. 252.

[6]Martini, p. 664.

CHAPTER VI

[1]Frye, p. 36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bernd, Clifford A. Theodor Storm's craft of fiction: The torment of a narrator. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1963.

Brinkmann, Richard. Wirklichkeit und Illusion: Studien über Gehalt und Grenzen des Begriffs Realismus für die erzählende Dichtung des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1957.

Culler, Jonathan. Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Derrida, Jacques. Of Grammatology. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Donato, Eugenio, and Richard Macksey, eds. The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, 1972.

Ellis, J. M. "Narration in Storm's Der Schimmelreiter." Germanic Review, 44, No. 1, (1969).

----------. Narration in the German novelle: Theory and interpretation. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Findlay, Ian. "Myth and Redemption in Theodor Storm's Der Schimmelreiter." Papers on Languages and Literature, 11, No. 4, (1975).

Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.

Frye, Northrup. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. New York: Atheneum, 1966.

Goldammer, Peter, ed. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Theodor Storm und Gottfried Keller. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1967.

Hamilton, Edith. Mythology. New York: The New American Library, 1942.

Harrari, Josué V., ed. Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Hermand, Jost. Von Mainz nach Weimar (1793 - 1919): Studien zur deutschen Literatur. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1969.

Jauß, Hans Robert. Literaturgeschichte als Provokation. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.

Jennings, Lee B. "'Shadows from the void' in Theodor Storm's Novellen." Germanic Review, 37, No. 3, (1962).

Klein, Johannes. Geschichte der deutschen Novelle von Goethe bis zur Gegenwart. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1956.

Krieger, Murray. Theory of Criticism: A Tradition and Its System. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Kunz, Josef, ed. Novelle, vol. XV of Wege der Forschung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.

Laage, Karl Ernst, ed. Theodor Storm-Erich Schmidt: Briefwechsel, Kritische Ausgabe, 2 Vols. Berlin: E. Schmidt Verlag, 1972.

Leach, Edmund. Culture and Communication, the Logic by which symbols are connected: An introduction to the use of structuralist analysis in social anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Martini, Fritz. Deutsche Literatur im bürgerlichen Realismus. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964.

McCormick, E. Allen. Theodor Storm's Novellen: Essays on literary technique. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964

Ozment, Stephen E. The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth-Century Germany and Switzerland. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Rogers, Terence Joh. Techniques of solopsism: A study of Theodor Storm's narrative fiction. Cambridge: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 1970.

Schiwy, Gunther. Der französische Strukturalismus: Mode, Methode, Ideologie. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1969.

Silz, Walter. "Theodor Storm's Schimmelreiter." PMLA, 61, (1946).

----------. Realism and reality: Studies in the German novelle of poetic realism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Storm, Theodor. Der Schimmelreiter. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam Jun., 1976.

Storm, Theodor. Werke in zwei Bänden. ed. by Peter Goldammer. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1969.

Stuckert, Franz. Theodor Storm, der Dichter in seinem Werk. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1966.

Wedburg, Lloyd Warren. The theme of loneliness in Theodor Storm's Novellen. The Hague: Mouton, 1964.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956.